k with preceding

Mr. ROBE's Fourth LETTER To Mr. FISHER,

WHEREIN

His *Preface* to a 2d Edit. of his *Review* is conſidered; the Promoters of the Divine Work, oppoſed by Mr. *Fiſher*, are vindicated from his Libel againſt them, concerning TOLERATION-PRINCIPLES: As alſo, the Fraud and Falſhood of the Reverend Mr. *Ralph Erskine*'s *Appendix* to his *Fraud and Falſhood*, &c. is laid open.

SCHEGKIUS *in Dedicat. con. an. trin.*

Vere hoc mihi dicturus videor, niſi accuratius homines incipiunt Philoſophari, futurum ut nullus ſectarum, nullus hoereſium ſit finis futurus, quando hac ignoratione actidat, ut neque accipere legitime, neque reddere rationem diſputatores imperiti valeant.

EDINBURGH,

Printed by R. FLEMING and [illegible], and ſold by J. TRAIL Bookſeller in the Parliament-cloſe, and other Booksellers. 1743.

BRITISH MUSEUM

Dear Brother,

I Have ſeen your *Preface*, to a ſecond Edition of your Review.----It gives me no ſmall Uneaſineſs, that you are, contrary to all Appearances, jealous of the Sincerity of my Affection towards you.----I have endeavoured to recover you from the dangerous Errors of your Way, with the Spirit of Meekneſs, to the Judgment of every unprejudiced Reader; and yet you inſinuate, Page 9th of your *Preface*, that I call you *dear Brother*, with the ſame Diſpoſition, as *Joab* ſpake to *Amaſa*, 2 *Sam.* xx. 9.----My plain and open Dealing with you, and avowed Oppoſition to you, in your very ſinful Courſe, while I ſhew all that Love and Reſpect due to your Perſon, diſtinguiſhes my Diſpoſition and Carriage ſufficiently, from *Joab*'s towards *Amaſa*.----You ſay in the firſt Words of your Preface, *That Mr.* Webſter *and I have thrown Abundance of contemptuous Names upon you.*----Sir, if you can condeſcend upon any one, I ſhall give you all Chriſtian Satisfaction, and undertake the ſame for Mr. *Webſter*.----But tho' you have not been able to diſtinguiſh betwixt an Adverſary to your Way, and an Adverſary to your Perſon, but have thought every Blow that was given to your Error, was a mortal Wound to your dear Self, yet many others can, and do.----If in expoſing your Errors, your Reputation be expoſed, you muſt blame them for occaſioning it, and not us.

It gives no Pleaſure, that I and others have beſtowed upon you Labour in vain. You ſay, *As an Evidence of my Perſuaſion, that the Argument therein againſt the preſent deluſive Work, and the Principles of the Promoters thereof, ſtands untouched, I have allowed it* (the Review) *to be re-publiſhed without*

the leaſt Amendment.----The World now judge, whether your Argument is touched and overturned alſo, or not.----A Gentleman who had read your *Review*, and the Anſwers to it, happening, t'other Day, to read this Paſſage in your *Preface*, ſaid to me, Mr. *Fiſher* puts me in Mind of a deſperately obſtinate Scold, who being reproved and cenſured for Calumny and Slander, and having her Mouth ſtopped as to Reaſon, bawleth ſtill out after all, *I'll ſay it yet, I'll ſay it yet.*----You deſerve a ſharper Reproof for your Obſtinacy in this, than I am willing to give you from the Preſs; yet, in Love to the Truth, and your own Soul, reprove again I muſt; and I hope God will enable me to be both mild as to the Manner of it, and convincingly clear in the Matter and Cauſe thereof.

As to what you add, That there are ſeveral Things in our Writings that ſtrengthen your Argument, I and others wiſh much, that in a *Preface* conſiſting of 16 Pages, you had given ſome Inſtance of it, and not referred us, after ſo long a Time, to afterwards, and I am perſuaded, if you could have done it, you would.

I have before me the Reverend Mr. *Ralph Erskine's Fraud and Falſhood diſcovered, with an* Appendix *relating eſpecially to imaginary Ideas of ſpiritual Things*, &c.----He attacks me much in your Way.---- I doubt not but this my Letter to you will be communicate to him.----Pleaſe then, dear Sir, to take in good Part, that I lay open and diſcover the Fraud and Falſhood of ſaid *Appendix*, in the ſame Letter, wherein I diſcover yours.

Before I come to Particulars, it will be of Uſe to ſeverals, that they may read the controverſial Writings of you two, and hear your Sermons, without being hurt by them, that I diſcover ſome of the fraudulent and fallacious Artifices, you make much Uſe of to oppreſs your Adverſary, and the Truth.

Inſtances

Inſtances of each of theſe will be given in our Progreſs.

Firſt, It is uſual for you to endeavour to faſten Doctrines upon your Adverſaries, which never entered into their Thoughts, and cannot be deduced from their Writings, with the leaſt Appearance of Juſtice or Plauſibility.----The Method you take to do this, is by putting your own forced Comments and Meanings upon your Adverſary's Words; and when you have made it as groſs as you can, you honeſtly argue againſt it as your Adverſary's Opinion.

2*dly*, Whatever Error or Sin you alledge againſt your Adverſary, you never fail to make them fundamental, damnable, and the moſt to be abhorred Evils, and give the alledged Error the Name of ſome *iſm* or other of the worſt Sort.

3*dly*, Every Opinion of your own you make it an Article of Faith, and lay as great Streſs upon it, as you ought to do upon the moſt clear and fundamental Point; which judicious *Flavel* ſaith, is a pernicious Evil. It is alſo a certain Evidence of Enthuſiaſm.

Laſtly, It hath been your never-failing Practice, to endeavour to render your Adverſaries odious, by the vileſt Slanders and Reproaches.---- How far this tends to clear up and find out the Truth, let others judge.----Yet ſo it is, that *Machiavel*'s old Rule is a ſacred Maxim with you, *Fortiter calumniare, aliquid adherebit. Throw Dirt enough, ſome on't will ſtick.*---A Reproach will run, where a juſt Vindication will not creep; beſides, it prejudiceth many againſt what ſuch ſay.---This hath been your Practice ſo much in the Pulpit, that it is no Wonder you deal ſo much in it when you write.

To be particular,---You ſay, Page 3d of your *Preface, That all you deſign at preſent is to illuſtrate, what you take to be the chief Spring of the preſent awful Deluſion, next to the Corruption of Nature, and that is the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas, as managed by the Ring-leaders of Enthuſiaſm at this Day,*

both

both abroad and at home.---Now, Sir, allow me to obſerve, *firſt*, That here you not only throw a contemptuous Name, but a vile Calumny upon us, which you ſhall never be able to prove, *Ring-leaders of Enthuſiaſm.* *2dly*, The Doctrine of imaginary Ideas, as managed by us, or any other, can never be the Spring of this bleſſed Work, which you blaſphemouſly call, *the preſent awful Deluſion.* For, I can aſſure you, I never preached upon this Doctrine here, or elſewhere, nor ever heard any other, whom you are pleaſed to call the Promoters of this Work, preach on the Subject. This glorious Appearance of our God in his Sanctuary, had been for ſome Months at *Cambuſlang*, and here, before ever I ſaw Mr. *Edward*'s excellent Sermon.---Tho' it appears, from the 9th Page of your *Preface*, that you have preached upon the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas to your Philoſophical Audience; yet, I am perſwaded, it would be unintelligible, and uſeleſs to mine; and therefore, whatever hath been the Spring of Things here, the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas hath not.----You ſay, *You deſign to illuſtrate the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas.*----I queſtion much, if the Teachers of Philoſophy will recommend your Performance to their Scholars, when they are teaching the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas, as what will illuſtrate and make it clear to them.

Next Paragraph you ſay,---*The plain obvious Meaning of what they advance on this Subject, is ſtated in the Review, Page 11th, That we cannot think upon any Thing inviſible or ſpiritual, without ſome Degree of Imagination.*---This is indeed not only the plain obvious Meaning of what Mr. *Edwards* advanceth, but his very expreſs Words, except, *or ſpiritual*, which you add.---In my ſecond Letter to you, Page 9th, I have proved evidently, That Mr. *Edwards* hath ſaid nothing in theſe Words, but what the beſt and ableſt of our Divines have ſaid before him, and much in the ſame Terms.---If you had been fairly enquiring after Truth, you ſhould have anſwered

ſwered this, and removed what I had advanced in Vindication of Mr. *Edwards*, before you had renewed your Charge againſt him. At this Rate Men may continue Controverſies to the World's End:---It was eaſier to wave it, than do what you ſhall never be able to do.

Indeed, Pages 11th and 12th of your Preface, you ſay; *As to the Divines quoted by Mr.* Robe, *in Support of Mr.* Edward's *Doctrine, it would be eaſy to ſhew from them, That tho' they grant that imaginary Ideas of God, are ready to attend our Meditations of him, in this State of Imperfection, yet they expreſly condemn theſe Ideas as the Fruit of a corrupt Imagination.*

How many Miſtakes are here? Whether wilful or through Inadvertency, you beſt know;--It is my Buſineſs now to lay them open.----*Firſt*, If they grant that imaginary Ideas of God are ready to attend our Meditations of him, in this State of Imperfection, as you aſſert, then, ſuppoſing Mr. *Edwards* ſpeaking, in the Paſſage under Debate, of imaginary Ideas of God, which yet is not ſo, in that Caſe he ſaith no more then what you aſſert theſe Divines ſay, when he ſaith, *I do appeal to any Man of the greateſt Powers of Mind, whether or no he is able to fix his Thoughts on God, or Chriſt, or the Things of another World, without imaginary Ideas attending his Meditation.*---If they are ready to attend our Meditations of God in this State of Imperfection, in the Opinion of theſe great Divines, Mr. *Edwards* might well appeal to Men of the greateſt Powers of Mind, *&c.* as above.---What mean you then to make ſo great a Buſtle about Mr. *Edwards* ſaying no more, than what you aſſert our beſt Divines have ſaid? *2dly*, You are miſtaken in ſaying, That our Divines in the Paſſages I quote and refer to, are ſpeaking either of imaginary Ideas of God, or ſuch imaginary Ideas, as are a natural Fruit of Corruption.---In theſe Paſ-

ſages

ſages they ſpeak not of theſe preciſely, but of theſe imaginary Ideas, and that Exerciſe of the Imagination when we think of God, or ſpiritual Things, which ariſeth from our natural Conſtitution, or from our finite and corporeal Nature, whereby nothing can come into the Underſtanding, before it hath been in the Senſe or Imagination, except what is innate, or by Reflection;---and therefore, they condemn not theſe Ideas as a Fruit of a corrupt Imagination, ſeeing they ariſe from our finite and corrupt Nature, and would have been as unavoidable, if we had continued in a State of Innocence as now; particularly *Bury* upon *Original Sin*, Page 354. "It is true, that *Adam*, tho' created with full "and perfect Knowledge in Naturals and Supernatu- "rals, that was neceſſarily required to his Bleſſedneſs; "yet, as *Swaver* well determineth, in the Uſe of "his Knowledge he had Recourſe to Phantaſms in "the Imagination, becauſe that is a natural Way to "the Soul, while joined to the Body;"---only they declare, That the Underſtanding proceeding, by what Aſſiſtance the Imagination can give, to think upon God or ſpiritual Things, ſhould remove all theſe imaginary Ideas from their Conception of God, as I have endeavoured to explain to you at greater Length than any of them, and more expreſly, Pages 8th,---9th of my ſecond Letter to you.---So that Mr. *Edwards* and theſe Divines ſpeak of the ſame imaginary Ideas, not of God, but attending our Meditations of him;---and ſome of them, without giving any Direction, more than Mr. *Edwards* doth, anent the Procedure of the Underſtanding, to remove theſe Helps, when they have ſerved as far as they ſhould in our thinking upon God, or ſpiritual Things,---particularly judicious *Flavel*;---ſo that it ſtill remains firm, that Mr. *Edwards* had ſaid no more in this than theſe Divines, and many others before him.

The

The Paſſages you cite from *Anthony Burgeſs*, tho' they contain what is moſt ſolid and true, yet they are not in the leaſt to the Purpoſe in Hand;---for he is not ſpeaking in theſe Paſſages of the Imagination, as a Faculty and Power of the human Nature, nor of the natural Uſe and Exerciſe of it, nor of the Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of it to our conceiving, even of ſpiritual Things, which is the preciſe Point, wherein the preſent Debate is concerned with the Imagination, and imaginary Ideas: But the worthy Author is ſpeaking of the Imagination as corrupted, and depraved by Sin, where it takes the Bit in its Teeth, and runs away with its Rider, and which noway pertains to the Queſtion in Hand, which, as already obſerved, concerns the Imagination, as a Faculty abſtractly from its Qualities, pure, or corrupted;---ſo that he neither contradicts himſelf, nor, which is the ſame, Mr. *Edwards*.---Howſoever appoſite and ſuitable, what this good Man ſaith, is to every Time ſince the Entrance of Sin into the World, there is nothing in it applicable to this bleſſed Work at this preſent Time, as you would inſinuate.----So much then for what Mr. *Edwards* expreſly ſaith and meaneth.

The Meaning, you ſay, you gave of theſe Words, is, *That Images of ſpiritual Things muſt be repreſented to our Fancy, elſe we can have no Thought about them; and conſequently, that we can have no Thought of God, or of Chriſt, without ſome viſionary Form or Shape repreſented to our Imagination*, Page 1ſt of the *Preface*, referring to Page 11th of the *Review*.

That you have greatly injured Mr. *Edwards*, in fixing this monſtruous Doctrine upon him, not only already appeareth from my ſecond Letter to you, from Page 5th to Page 13th, but I hope will further appear from the following Anſwer to the Paſſages you alledge, to prove this monſtruous Meaning upon him, not formerly mentioned. The firſt

is

is as you have it Page 2d:----*Marks of the true Spirit, Edinburgh* Edition Page 27th, *London* Edition Page 22d. "As God has given us ſuch a Faculty as "the Imagination, and has ſo made us, that we can't "think of Things ſpiritual and inviſible, without "ſome Exerciſe of this Faculty; ſo it appears to me, "that ſuch is our State and Nature, that this Faculty is really ſubſervient and helpful to the other "Faculties of the Mind."------This Paſſage was expreſly taken in by me, with the former Paſſage, quoted in your *Review*, in the 8th Page of my ſecond Letter to you, where I ſhew, that theſe Words neither expreſs nor imply the monſtruous Meaning you pervert them unto.----It is not fair Dealing to quote them as a ſecond Proof not formerly mentioned, until you had taken off my Anſwer, which you ſhall never be able to do.----However I ſhall undergo the Drudgery to anſwer a ſecond Time.----Your Reaſoning, ſuch as it is, from this Paſſage is, *Now if we cannot think of Things ſpiritual and inviſible, without ſome Exerciſe of Imagination, it is plain we cannot think upon God, or Chriſt, or the Pardon of Sins, &c. without ſome Exerciſe of it*----It is moſt plain, and uncontroverted; ſo thought learned *Charnock*, Vol. I. *London* Edition 1684, Page 125. "While we "are in the Body, and ſurrounded with fleſhly Matter,-----ſomething of Senſe will interpoſe itſelf in "our pureſt Conceptions of ſpiritual Things; for "the Faculties which ſerve for Contemplation, are "either corporeal, as the Senſe and Fancy, or ſo "allied to them, that nothing paſſes into them but "by the Organs of the Body." From this you infer,----*And therefore the only proper Uſe that can be made of Imagination, in helping the other Faculties of the Soul (according to Mr.* Edwards) *muſt be to convey Ideas of inviſible Objects unto the Mind, by imaginary Forms or Pictures of them.*----This doth by no Means follow;-----for tho' we cannot think even of ſpiritual and inviſible Things without ſome Exerciſe

of

of Imagination, and ſome Help from it to the other Faculties, yet this is not by the Imagination's preſenting any imaginary Form or Picture of them:--- This is not the Uſe of the Imagination about ſpiritual Things, which are nowiſe the Object of this Faculty: This Way it would be ſo far from being helpful to the other Faculties of the Soul, to think upon ſpiritual Things, that it would be hurtful, and miſlead them;---yet there are many other Ways, whereby the Imagination is helpful to the Underſtanding and Judgment, to conceive and judge of ſpiritual Things;---of which I gave Inſtances in my ſecond Letter to you, Pages 8th, 9th,---where, from the negative and metaphorical Perfections of God,--- I ſhall here give you the Inſtance of his poſitive Perfections, and chuſe to give it you rather in Mr. *Charnock*'s Words, than mine own,---*ubi ſupra*, Page 123, "Whatſoever we ſpeak or think of God, "is handed firſt to us by the Notice we have of "ſome Perfection in the Creature, and explains to "us ſome particular Excellency of God, rather "than the Fulneſs of his Eſſence.----God in his "Word is pleaſed to ſtep below his own Excellency, and point us to thoſe Excellencies in his "Works, whereby we may aſcend to the Knowledge of thoſe Excellencies, which are in his Nature."--And again, Page 128, "We cannot poſſibly ſpeak or think of God, unleſs we transfer "the Names of created Perfections to him; yet "we are to conceive of them in a higher Manner, "when we apply them to the Divine Nature, "than when we conſider them in the ſeveral Creatures formerly, exceeding thoſe Perfections and "Excellencies which are in the Creature, and in a "more excellent Manner, (as one ſaith) Though "we cannot comprehend God without the Help "of ſuch Reſemblances, *yet we may, without "making an Image of him*; ſo that Inability of ours "excuſeth thoſe Apprehenſions of him, from any

" Way offending againſt his Divine Nature."—— Had the Author been alive at this Day, he could not have ſpoken more appoſitely and ſuitably to our preſent Times.---I might have alſo inſtanced, That all the Knowledge we acquire of God and ſpiritual Things, by outward Means, is conveyed to us by Seeing or Hearing.---The ſenſible Signs, whether the Works or Word of God, leave their Species or Image upon the Imagination, which is ever afterwards helpful to the other Faculties, by preſenting the Images of theſe Signs unto them:---But I forbear further to enlarge upon this.---From all this you ſee it clear as the Sun, that the Imagination may be uſeful to the other Faculties, to think upon ſpiritual and inviſible Things, without conveying Ideas of them unto the Mind, by imaginary Forms or Pictures of them.

You inſinuate this is Mr. *Edwards* Meaning that you have given; becauſe he adds,---" It appears to " me manifeſt, That God has really made Uſe of " this Faculty, (*viz.* the Imagination) to truly Divine " Purpoſes.;---and ſo it appears to me, elſe he would never have created Man with it:---But, my dear Sir, I believe it will do better for us, to take the Words as they ſtand in Mr. *Edwards* Sermon, and honeſtly reſtore to them ſome harmleſs Sentences, you have in your uſual Way dropt: They are thus; " It appears to me manifeſt, in many In- " ſtances I have been acquainted with, That God " has really made Uſe of this Faculty to truly Di- " vine Purpoſes; eſpecially in ſome that are more " ignorant, God ſeems to condeſcend to their Cir- " cumſtances, and deal with them as Babes; as of " old he inſtructed his Church, while in a State " of Ignorance and Minority, by Types and out- " ward Repreſentations."---Now, what will you draw from this?---Not that this Faculty was made Uſe of to the Purpoſe of giving them imaginary Ideas of God, and ſpiritual Things; for this is no

Divine

Divine Purpoſe, and this Faculty was never deſign'd of God for this Purpoſe.---Beſides, the Types and outward Repreſentations under the Law, tho' they were ſymbolical Repreſentations of ſpiritual Things, yet they were not outward Pictures or Images of God, and ſpiritual Things.

You add two Paragraphs, Pages 4th, 5th and 6th, concerning the Types of the Law, wherein there are ſeveral Paſſages that drop pure Nonſenſe upon your Readers Underſtanding;---ſuch as Page 5th, "That *Hezekiah* called the Brazen Serpent *Nehuſhtan*, a Piece of Braſs, that could not of itſelf "form the leaſt Notion in their Minds of the ſpiritual Bleſſings, which were deſign'd to be repreſented by it."---For this very Reaſon, it might have been called *Nehuſhtan*, more than 700 Year before this, about the Time when it was firſt erected.---Did ever any ſay, That it could of itſelf form any Notion in their Minds of the ſpiritual Bleſſings, which were deſign'd to be repreſented by it? To what Purpoſe is this impertinent Obſervation?---Your next Obſervation is of the ſame Sort;---"Likewiſe, when the High-prieſt entred within the "Vail, as he was then removed from the Sight "of their bodily Eyes, ſo they could receive no "Inſtruction from the Picture of an abſent Man "upon their Imagination, nor by Recollecting "upon their Fancy the Ideas of his Garments, "and of the Blood of Beaſts, which he carried "alongſt with him into the holieſt of all."---Do not you ſay, in the End of this Paragraph? "The "whole Deſign of that Inſtitution, being to ſignify the great Sacrifice of Chriſt, and his Interceſſion within the Vail, as founded upon that "meritorious Oblation, *Heb.* ix. *ver.* 24."---Now, Sir, could they be led in their Underſtanding by the Type, to the Idea and Conception of the Anti-type, or ſpiritual Things ſignified, without any Idea of the Type, or Shadow of the ſpiritual Things?

Could they have any other Idea of the High-priest entred within the Vail, out of the Sight of their bodily Eyes, but an imaginary Idea, or an Idea of him, by the Help of their Imagination?--And was it not by this imaginary Idea of him, his Garments, and the Blood of Beasts, as Types, their Understandings were conducted to a View of the Things signified, by Knowledge and Faith?---Indeed they, who dwelt upon the Picture and Image of these sensible Objects, or upon the sensible Objects themselves when present, without passing from them, and by them, as instituted outward Means, to the Things signified, they continued without the Things signified, yea without any Benefit by the external Signs.---From all this, the very Reverse of what you assert is evident, That the imaginary Idea of the typical Representations, produced much Benefit to the Souls of the People, who understood and kept to the Use and Design of them; and this they did not as natural, but as instituted Signs.---What you add is a blundering Mistake, "That the great Design of all the Types was "to lead the People off from these Figures, which "were the Objects of their external Senses, to the "spiritual Blessings signified by them, which were "quite different and distinct from the Types themselves, and were the Objects of Faith, and not of "Sense;"---and so it had been better not to have instituted these Types, which had this for their great Design, to lead People off from these Figures, which were the Objects of Sense, *&c.* being if they had not been instituted, they would have been in no Danger from them;--:whereas, to speak properly, their great Design was to teach and instruct the People in the Knowledge of the spiritual Things signified by them, and to assist their Understandings in conceiving these Objects of Faith, and which they never could do, without a considerable Exercise of the Imagination:---And therefore the Mistake

you

you alledge upon Mr. *Edwards*, was what never I am perſuaded entred into his Head, and what you have given, can give no Evidence of, *viz. That God inſtructed the People under the Old Teſtament, by their Imagination, allowing them to form upon it the Image or Picture of ſpiritual Things, in Reſemblance of the Types that were inſtituted under that Diſpenſation.*---They behoved indeed, by the Exerciſe of their Imagination, when the Situation of the Types required it, to form an Idea of the Type, that their Underſtanding and Judgment might be inſtructed in the Knowledge of the Anti-type;---and this is all that Mr. *Edwards* Words expreſs, or can import.

You proceed, Page 6th, "*To ſhew that imaginary Notions of Things are* (according to Mr. *Edwards* and his Followers) *the very Spring of this Deluſion*,"----as you are pleaſed to Nick name this good Work. As alſo, as you ſay in the End of the next Paragraph, Page 7th. *To illuſtrate what I have ſaid, review* Page 13, *to prove, that this Work is begun by Repreſentations of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination, which are ſucceeded by imaginary or viſionary Repreſentations ſeemingly more agreeable.* For the Proof of all this, you quote a Paſſage from the *New England* Narrative, written by Mr. *Edwards*, which, you ſay, will put his Doctrine, upon this Head, out of all Manner of Debate.----The Paſſage, *Edinburgh* Edition 1737, and Page 87. And ſaid *Boſton*'s Edition, Page 53, "I do not ſuppoſe "that they themſelves imagined, that they ſaw any "Thing with their bodily Eyes, but only have had "within them Ideas ſtrongly impreſſed, and as it "were, lively Pictures in their Minds: As for In"ſtance, ſome when in great Terrors, through "Fear of Hell, have had lively Ideas of a dreadful "Furnace. Some when their Hearts have been "ſtrongly impreſſed, and their Affections greatly "moved with a Senſe of the Beauty and Excellency

"of

" of Chriſt, it has wrought on their Imagination " ſo, that, together with a Senſe of his glorious " ſpiritual Perfections, there has ariſen in the Mind " an Idea of one of glorious Majeſty, and of a ſweet " and gracious Aſpect: So ſome, when they have " been greatly affected with Chriſt's Death, have, " at the ſame Time, a lively Idea of Chriſt hanging " upon the Croſs, and of his Blood running from " his Wounds."----Tho' Mr. *Fiſher* unfairly ſtops here, yet I ſhall ſet down what remains of this Paragraph.----Mr. *Edwards* adds, " Which Things " wont be wondered at by them, that have obſer- " ved how ſtrong Aſſertions about temporal Mat- " ters will excite lively Ideas and Pictures of diffe- " rent Things in the Mind." This is ſufficient to ſhew every intelligent Perſon, that there is no Ground of Objection from ſome being thus affected; and that it is no more than an uſual natural Effect, in ſome Conſtitutions, of the Intenſeneſs of the Mind, and Strength of the Affections, affecting the Body, and thereby, in ſome Degree, diſordering the Imagination; from whence it is, that the Ideas, or Pictures upon the Mind are ſtronger than ordinary, or would be, without ſome Degree of natural Diſorder.----To this Purpoſe Mr. *Edwards* ſaith, in the Words immediately before theſe quoted by Mr. *Fiſher*, " But ſuch Impreſſions on the Imagination, as " have been more uſual, ſeem to me, to be plainly " no other, than what is to be expected in human " Nature in ſuch Circumſtances, and what is the " natural Reſult of the ſtrong Exerciſe of the Mind, " and Impreſſions on the Heart."----And in the Paragraph after the Words you quote,--- he ſheweth, that the vigorous Exerciſe of the Mind, doth more ſtrongly impreſs it with imaginary Ideas in ſome than in others, is owing to different Conſtitutions, and to ſomething peculiar in Circumſtances.----He alſo ſaith, Page 54, " Great Care hath been taken, " both in Publick and in Private, to teach Perſons

" the

" the Difference between what is ſpiritual and what " is merely imaginary. I have often warned Per- " ſons not to lay the Streſs of their Hope on any " Ideas of any outward Glory, or any external " Thing whatſoever, and have met with no Oppo- " ſition in ſuch Inſtructions; but 'tis not ſtrange, if " ſome weaker Perſons, in giving an Account of " their Experiences, have not ſo prudently diſtin- " guiſhed between the ſpiritual and imaginary Part, " which ſome, *that have not been well affected to* " *Religion, might take Advantage of.*"---- From all this, now honeſtly laid before the intelligent Reader, let him judge, if Mr. *Edwards* Doctrine, about imaginary Ideas, be not ſolid and judicious; and if you, by concealing thir Paſſages, by which our Author explains himſelf, and the Paſſage you quote, have not done what you could, not only to injure Mr. *Edwards*, but your Readers, by impoſing upon them, and miſleading them from the Truth.

Further, to ſhew the Inſufficiency of this Paſſage, to prove what you propoſe, and your Spirit, let the Reader give it what Epithet he thinks its due, in adducing it.---- Obſerve, *firſt*, That ſeveral Paſſages were read from the Tent at *Stirling* by the Reverend Mr. *Ebenezer Erskine*, out of this very *New England* Narrative, as containing good News of the Succeſs of the Goſpel in *America*, without any Exception, at the Goodneſs of this Work upon the Account of this Paſſage.---- This ſeveral, to whom I can give Credit, told me they heard him do, within theſe four or five Years.

2*dly*, Let the Reader judge, whether there be ſo much as the leaſt Inſinuation in the Paſſage you quote, *That imaginary Notions of Things are the very Spring of what you call, this Deluſion; or, that this Work is begun by Repreſentation of dreadful Objects upon the Imagination, which are ſucceeded by imaginary or viſionary Repreſentations, ſeemingly more agreeable.*----Mr. *Edwards* neither gives here

an

an Account of the Beginning of this Work upon them, nor of their Outgate.----He had done that at great Length in the former Part of this Narrative, beginning at Page *mihi* 19th.---- There he gives an Account of this Work's being begun with a Conviction of Sin, and of their Miſery becauſe of Sin,---. and of their Outgate afterwards, in the Way of the Goſpel, by Faith in the Lord Jeſus.----Beſides, in this Paſſage, he gives the Account only of ſome, yea a very few, as will appear, by comparing it with a Paſſage he hath, Page *mihi* 22. "Some few "Inſtances there have been of Perſons, who have "had ſuch a Senſe of God's Wrath for Sin, that "they have been over-born, and made to cry out "under an aſtoniſhing Senſe of their Guilt, wonde- "ring that God ſuffers ſuch guilty Wretches to live "upon Earth, and that he doth not ſend them im- "mediately to Hell; and ſometimes their Guilt does "ſo glare them in the Face, that they are in ex- "ceeding Terror, for fear that God will inſtantly "do it; but more commonly, the Diſtreſſes under "legal Awakenings have not been to ſuch a De- "gree."----Suppoſing that he had given ſuch an Account of theſe few, as you unfairly alledge,---it will be a Way of arguing peculiar to yourſelf.----Mr. *Edwards* ſaith, it is ſo with a few, therefore it is ſo with 300. ---The Cauſe you maintain can admit of no other Kind of Reaſoning.

Let us now proceed to your judicious Reaſoning from this Paſſage.---- 1*ſt*, You ſay, *However artfully Mr.* Edward *endeavours to colour this Matter, yet it is evident from this Paſſage, that the Subjects of this Work, at the ſame Time they are under Terrors of Hell, have a lively picture of a dreadful Furnace upon their Imaginations.*----It is evident only of a few of the Subjects of this Work, which is far from all, as your Alledgance is; and even this is far from proving, that the Work begins with this, as is already obſerved.----And as to theſe few, who when they

they are under Terrors, through Fear of Hell, have had lively Ideas of a dreadful Furnace. What if they had? What can you infer from it? Will you infer, that they had a wrong Idea of Hell, and inconceiveably leſs dreadful than it is in itſelf? So it is indeed. For it cannot enter into the Heart of Man to conceive the Dreadfulneſs of Hell.------ Can you infer, that to have an Idea upon the Imagination of a dreadful Furnace, when a Perſon is under Terrors, through the Fear of Hell, is unjuſt and unreaſonable, and a Deluſion?------It will not follow.---Our bleſſed Lord calls Hell a Furnace of Fire, *Matth.* xiii. 42.------Now, my dear Sir, try if you can think of Hell, under this figurative Deſcription, without an Idea or Picture, to take your own Word, of a Furnace of Fire. I defy you, or any Man elſe, to do it.---And was it any Harm, that theſe few, who happened to think of Hell, in this figurative metaphorical Deſcription of it, had ſuch an Idea upon their Imagination?----If you ſay, it was a lively Idea,----I ſay it was not a Bit the worſe.----If you inſiſt, that it was ſuch a lively Idea, as they imagined they ſaw this dreadful Furnace before their Eyes, as you, in your uſual Way, aſſert a few Lines after,---by calling this and other Things, Inſtances of *a viſionary Nature*,----I anſwer,---Mr. *Edwards* declares expreſly the contrary, *That they did not imagine they ſaw any Thing with their bodily Eyes.* ---And if they had, all that could be ſaid was, that they were miſtaken, and that in the Time they thought ſo, their Imagination was in ſome Degree diſordered, which would not have been their Sin, but their phyſical Diſeaſe and Affliction.----Nothing of this is an Evidence of a Perſon's not being under a Work of the Spirit of God, or being under a Work of the Devil, and Deluſion.----You have many Inſtances of this Kind in the Life of that good Woman *Eliſabeth Cairns*, whom the *Seceders* Claim ſo keenly as one of their Number, which ſhe might be,

and yet be a good Chriſtian from her Infancy. I ſhall mind you of one Inſtance, and leave Mr. *Edwards*'s People, or any other in like Circumſtances, to ſtand or fall with her.-----Only ſhe really thought ſhe ſaw, what they had only an Idea of upon their Imagination.------In the printed Copy, Page 60. ſhe ſaith, "When I was in this ſad Condition, and like "to loſe my Reaſon, I was one Day on my Knees "before God in Prayer, and, as I thought, both "Heaven and Hell were realized to my Mind, and "ſaw, as it were, the Devil mocking at me, and "ready to pull me unto him."—Now, my Friend, how was it ſhe thought both Hell and Heaven were realized to her Mind? It was not by her realizing them to herſelf by Faith, in this ſhe was altogether paſſive: Was it not by Impreſſions upon her Imagination? which was ſo ſtrong, as ſhe thought really ſhe ſaw, what ſhe had only a more than ordinary lively Idea of, by her Imagination, as is plain from the Manuſcript Copy, which is thus, "One Day I was "upon my Knees before God in Prayer, and I "thought Hell opened before me, and I ſaw the "Devil mocking at me, and ready to pull me unto "him."------Of this you may ſee other Inſtances in the Extracts from her Life, inſert in the Appendix to the ſixth Article of my *Narrative*.

You add, That it is evident from this Paſſage of Mr. *Edwards*, *That at the ſame Time their Affections are ſet in Motion, they imagine they ſee a Perſon of agreeable Aſpect, whom they take to be Chriſt.*---- This was indeed frequently the Caſe of *Eliſabeth Cairns*, as you may ſee Inſtances of in the fore-cited Appendix.------But as to the Perſons Mr. *Edwards* ſpeaks of, there is the very contrary evident to what you aſſert; he ſaith indeed, that "ſome when their "Hearts have been ſtrongly impreſſed, and their "Affections greatly moved with a Senſe of the Beauty and Excellency of Chriſt, it has wrought on their "Imagination ſo, that, together with a Senſe of his "glori-

" glorious ſpiritual Perfections, there has ariſen in " the Mind an Idea of one of glorious Majeſty, and " of a ſweet and a gracious Aſpect."------He ſpeaks not the leaſt Syllable here, of what you diſhoneſtly ſlip in to deceive your unwary Reader, *viz. That they imagine they ſee a Perſon of agreeable Aſpect, whom they take to be Chriſt.* Doth he not expreſly aſſert, in the Beginning of this Paſſage quoted by yourſelf, that they did not imagine they ſaw any Thing with their bodily Eyes.------I expected you would have given over the Trade of Forgery after it hath been ſo much expoſed in my former Letters to you.

You proceed, ſaying, It is evident from this Paſſage, *That Chriſt is ſometimes pictured upon their Imagination as hanging upon the Croſs, and Blood running from his Wounds.*----It is moſt evident, Mr. *Edwards* ſaith, " Some, when they have been greatly " affected with Chriſt's Death, have, at the ſame " Time, a lively Idea of Chriſt hanging upon the " Croſs, and of his Blood running from his Wounds." And where, my Friend, is the great Harm of this? Can you be affected with what was tranſacted at Mount *Calvary*, without ſuch an Idea more or leſs lively? Can you either preach or think upon, read or hear, *John* xix. 34, 35, 36, 37. without the Idea of Chriſt hanging upon the Croſs, and of his Blood running from his Wounds? *But one of the ſoldiers with a ſpear pierced his ſide, and forthwith came there out blood and water. And he that ſaw it bare record, and his record is true; and he knoweth he ſaith true, that ye might believe. For theſe things were done that the ſcripture ſhould be fulfilled, A bone of him ſhall not be broken. And again another ſcripture ſaith, They ſhall look upon him whom they have pierced.*----Now if you cannot think upon, or believe, either the Hiſtory or the Myſtery of theſe Words, without the Idea of Chriſt hanging upon the Croſs, *&c.* was it criminal for theſe mentioned

to

to have it? How ſtrong is your Attachment to your Schiſm, that, to maintain it, you'll throw up common Senſe, and endeavour to overturn the Nature of Things?----If it be poſſible to make you aſhamed of your Nonſenſe upon this Subject,----I ſhall preſent you and my Readers with a Paſſage from learned *Charnock* upon this Subject, Vol. II. *London* Edit. 1684, Page 750. ſpeaking of the Elements in the Lord's Supper, "Nothing can be more auxiliary to our "Souls in the underſtanding, remembring, *FANCYING* of them.----Here we may ſee the Sufferings of his Body, his Pains upon the Croſs; and "here *FANCY* may work about the inconceiveable "Troubles of his Soul.----Here Fancy may repreſent the piercing his Temples by the Thorns, and "the Dints made in his Body, which the Pſalmiſt "compares to Furrows, *Pſal.* cxxix. 3." Will you venture to give a doctrinal Warning againſt this Doctrine a ſecond Time? Is this Doctrine to be abhorred by all ſincere Chriſtians? Is all this Deluſion? Doth he not aſſert here the Neceſſity of the Exerciſe of the Imagination in our thinking upon, and remembering believingly the Sufferings of Jeſus Chriſt in the Uſe of the holy Supper? Doth he not aſſert here the Neceſſity and Uſefulneſs of Ideas by the Help of the Fancy, or Imagination of Chriſt hanging upon the Croſs, and of his bleſſed Wounds?

You add, *As this exactly correſponds with the repeated Accounts we have from abroad.*----If they do correſpond Accounts from abroad to Mr. *Edwards* Account, they give in ſo far no unfavourable Account.----*So I could produce* (write you) *many Inſtances of the like viſionary Nature amongſt ourſelves at home, both from what ſeverals have owned to myſelf, and from the unqueſtionable Information of others.*---If they be Inſtances of a viſionary Nature, they are not like to theſe Mr. *Edwards* gives, for he denies that theſe he ſpeaks of were ſuch.---When you give them, pleaſe to add Inſtances of the like Nature

Nature from *Eliſabeth Cairn*'s Life, for Illuſtration.---All the Inſtances you can give, it will not affect this Work much, if we ſhould give up with them.----If Things came to a good Iſſue with them, we won't reject them, tho' poſſibly they have been vapouriſh a little, while a Work of Conviction was going on with them.----If they be ſuch who have been under Awakening, and all is come to nothing with them, whereof there are ſeverals who are more wicked, and more under the Power of the Devil than before, we never ſaid ſuch were converted.----But after all, you have already manifeſted ſuch a lying Spirit, (I beg my Readers Pardon for this Uſe of the Word, as far as I can mind, for the firſt Time) and which hath been proven upon you a great many Times, that your Teſtimony can never be regarded.---I have given an Account, openly and frankly, of the worſt, known perſonally to me, in what relateth to this Affair, after my converſing with above 500 belonging to this and other Congregations. You'll find it in the ſixth Article of my *Narrative*.

Next Paragraph, Page 7th, you ſay, *If Candour and Ingenuity were to be expected from the Promoters of this Work, it would eaſily be acknowledged, that theſe imaginary Impreſſions are the very Spring of the whole Deceit.*----Pſal. cxx. 2, 3. *Deliver my ſoul, O Lord, from lying lips, and from a deceitful tongue. What ſhall be given unto thee: Or what ſhall be done unto thee, thou falſe tongue?*----Sir, the Promoters of this Work, Miniſters atteſting it, Gentlemen and others who have enquired narrowly into it, are of known and approven Honour and Honeſty, Candour and Ingenuity, and all Men who know them expect it from them, and depend upon their Teſtimony. All of them declare, that the Subjects of this Work, that were approven, with whom they converſed, ſome of them had a diſtinct Sight of Sin, and a deep Senſe of God's Wrath, ſome others expreſſed Love to a Redeemer, and the like; and

that

that imaginary Impreſſions, are not the very Spring of, what you maliciouſly call the whole Deceit.---- And as to myſelf, if I had in a ſmall Degree, deliberately miſrepreſented, falſifyed, and ſaid Things that are not, as you have done deliberately in your *Review*, I would have given up all Pretence to Candour and Ingenuity, and would never have looked, that any ſhould have expected them at my Hand. But, Sir, I defy you, and all in the Oppoſition, to prove one deliberate Lie or Falſification deſigned in all my Writings.---I hope the Lord's People will pray for me, who am hindered in the Lord's Work, by ſuch an Adverſary as you; for I truſt I have a good Conſcience, in all Things willing to live honeſtly.--- And ſeeing the Glory of God, and the Good of Souls call for it, and the Matter is of the higheſt Importance. *I ſay the truth in Chriſt, I lie not, my conſcience alſo bearing me witneſs in the Holy Ghoſt.*---- That theſe I looked upon as Converts, had a diſtinct Sight of Sin, a deep Senſe of the Wrath of God, and Love to the Redeemer, according to the Account they gave of themſelves, which, I have all the Reaſon could be expected, to believe, was ſincere and honeſt, and that as far as I could diſcover their Uneaſineſs and Diſtreſs began with a Conviction of Sin, and not with any horrible Repreſentations upon their Fancy; and that I neither declare this now, or any Time formerly, to put a *Blind* upon the World, but to remove your Prejudices, and of others, againſt what I am perſuaded was, and is a Work of the Spirit of God.

I have ſaid enough already, as to what you ſay is granted, that they have had Pictures and Images upon their Fancy, *&c.*----This hath been anſwered again and again.---- As to what you have ſaid, *That it is evident, that a rational Fear of Hell, could never produce the Picture of a dreadful Furnace, nor true Love to Chriſt, ever form any Image upon the Fancy, of a beautiful Man; nor could ſolid and ſcriptural*

Impreſ-

Impreſſions of his Death, ever beget upon the Imagination, the Figure of a Man hanging upon a Croſs, with Blood running from his Wounds.—It is evident, from what hath been ſaid, that the Imagination, put into the Circumſtances already ſo oft mentioned, is ſufficient to do all this;—and if theſe Ideas ſhould be, in a Degree, at any Time extraordinary, it will be no Prejudice to this Work, and nothing inconſiſtent with a real Work of Grace upon the Soul, to attribute it to the Imaginations being diſordered at ſuch a Time, in ſome Degree.

You ſay, *It can be eaſily accounted for, how one may be hurried into the Paſſion of Fear or Joy, in an irregular or confuſed Manner, by ſtrong Impreſſions upon the Imagination.* I am perſuaded, ſome are able eaſily to account for this; but do think it is, what you won't do eaſily, try it when you will. Be this as it will, I deny that this was the Caſe of the People we ſpeak of; other Cauſes have been aſſigned of their Fear and Joy, and well atteſted, and you ſhall never be able to prove, that ſtrong Impreſſions upon their Imagination was the Cauſe.—The Reaſon you aſſign for this is, *That the Affections that flow from the ſuperior Faculties of the Soul, are ſedate, orderly, and conducted by Reaſon.*—Altho' this hath been cleared in my third Letter to you, yet I further anſwer,—*Moſes* ſaith, *Heb.* xii. 21. *I exceedingly fear and quake.*—*David* ſaith, *Pſal.* cxix. 120. *My fleſh trembleth for fear of thee, and I am afraid of thy judgments.*—*Habbakuk* ſaith, iii.—16. *When I heard, my belly trembled: my Lips quivered at the voice: rotteneſs entered into my bones, and I trembled in myſelf, that I might reſt in the day of trouble.*—The Church in the *Song of Solomon*, ſaith again and again, *I am ſick of love.*—'Tis ſaid of the Diſciples, when our Lord appeared to them, after his Reſurrection, that *for a while, they believed not for joy*, Luke xxiv. 41. Were theſe Affections perfectly ſedate and calm, and abſolutely under the Con-

duct

duct of Reaſon? Were they not in their Shew, as high as theſe of the People we ſpeak of?—Whether did they flow from the ſuperior Faculties of the Soul or not? If they did, Why ſhould not the like Affections amongſt our People do ſo likewiſe? If they did not flow from the ſuperior Faculties of their Souls, it can never be a greater Evil in our People than in theſe, if this ſhall be alſo their Caſe.—Prejudice hath ſtrangely blinded you, and maimed your reaſoning Faculty.

In your 8th Page, you proceed to give the Reader my Judgment of imaginary Ideas of ſpiritual Things.—If you had done it honeſtly, you would have ſaid, that my Judgment of them, is what the Reader will find, by the Tenor of my whole ſecond Letter, that there can be no imaginary Idea of ſpiritual Things, and that howſoever the Imagination may be aſſiſting to the Underſtanding, to conceive of ſpiritual Things, yet theſe are not the Objects about which the Imagination can be converſant, neither can it receive any Species of them. This was my expreſſed Judgment, anent imaginary Ideas of ſpiritual Things, and this it continueth to be,—and you ſhall never be able to prove the contrary.

The Paſſage you quote, and attack, is from the 11th and 12th Pages of my ſecond Letter to you, in which you quarrel two Things, *firſt*, That I charge you with Nonſenſe. *2dly*, That I advance Poſitions of a Soul-ruining and dangerous Tendency, and to be abhorred by all ſerious Chriſtians.—I ſhall now examine both.

Firſt, You quarrel, that I charge you with Nonſenſe, and blundering in Philoſophy, in your reaſoning about imaginary Ideas.—I obſerve here, that you are more out of Humour, with my charging you with blundering Nonſenſe, than with all the Forgery, Falſhood and Miſrepreſentation I have proven upon you.—There are a Set of Men in the World, that I don't love you ſhould be like. I did indeed

charge

charge you with Nonſenſe and with Blunders in Philoſophy,—and proved my Charge alſo, as is referred to every intelligent Reader, who hath learned the very Initials of Philoſophy.—And here I again charge you with more ignorant and blundering Nonſenſe in your Vindication of it, and hope to make it good, to the Conviction of every Reader capable to judge in this Point.--- And really, my dear Friend, you ſeem not to underſtand the Subject; and if you can take Advice, you had much better drop it.---- *Firſt*, You ſay, I charged you with Nonſenſe, in naming an imaginary Idea, a ſenſible Repreſentation upon the Imagination.---So I did,---and proved it to be Nonſenſe alſo. Page 7th of my ſecond Letter to you, where you have theſe Words,--- "Hence it appears how far you are from ſpeaking like a Philoſopher, when you ſpeak ſo often of *a ſenſible Repreſentation of Things in and upon the Imagination*; particularly, Page 12. 13. Whatever Repreſentation is in and upon the Imagination is not ſenſible, or then the Object of any of the Senſes; but is made unto the Underſtanding, when *ſenſible Repreſentations are removed*, and received by it." If you had noticed this,---and eſſayed to anſwer it, if it did not convince you, it would have prevented your preſent Nonſenſe.---For thus you write, *Pref.* Pag. 9. *It is plain, that an imaginary Idea is the ſame with a ſenſible Repreſentation upon the Imagination, in regard the Imagination can receive nothing but ſenſible Objects; it is all one whether preſent or abſent, they are ſenſible Objects ſtill, on ſuch Objects as we apprehend by the Intervention of our Senſes.*---How much Nonſenſe is here! You give this as the Reaſon, why an imaginary Idea is the ſame with a ſenſible Repreſentation upon the Imagination; *becauſe the Imagination can receive nothing but ſenſible Objects, or ſuch Objects as we apprehend by the Intervention of our Senſes.*---Now Sir, the Imagination receives no ſenſible Objects, neither doth ever any ſenſible Object

enter into the Imagination;---for, if they did, the ſame ſenſible Object, would in caſe of Abſence, be both abſent from the Imagination, and preſent in it at the ſame Time, which is Nonſenſe, and a Contradiction.---What poſſibly you would be at, is, that the Imagination receiveth the ſimple Impreſſions, Species, Shape, or Likeneſs of particular and corporeal Objects, which it retaineth, and preſenteth to the Underſtanding when they are abſent, that ſo the Underſtanding may be helped to form an Idea of theſe Objects, by the Species of them preſented by the Imagination to the Underſtanding, as the Wax receiveth the Impreſſion of a Seal, not the Seal itſelf, but the Image of it.----But allowing this to be what you would have ſaid, yet, even in this Shape, what you ſaid was Nonſenſe;---for, tho' an imaginary Idea may be called a Repreſentation of ſenſible Objects upon the Imagination, yet it is no ſenſible Repreſentation of theſe ſenſible Objects. For, *firſt*, Theſe Objects are abſent at the Time; and ſo, tho' they are ſenſible Objects in themſelves, yet, at the Time, they are not actually the Objects of any of the Senſes, elſe the working of the Imagination could have no Place. 2*dly*, The Repreſentation of theſe ſenſible Objects, is not ſenſible; for, altho' the Species in the Imagination are corporeal or material, yet they are ſo ſubtile, that they can never affect any of the Senſes, nor is it deſigned they ſhould;---they can only be perceived by the Underſtanding;---but how, no Man ever did, or ever ſhall in this Eſtate explain.---If you'll put in your next INTELLIGIBLE REPRESENTATION, for SENSIBLE REPRESENTATION of ſenſible Objects, it may be admitted.---What you add about Dreams is nothing to the Purpoſe; for, if the Imagination imagine abſent ſenſible Objects as preſent, when the Senſes and rational Part are bound up, it is evident it is deceived, and all is but Dream and Illuſion, and doth not make the Repreſentation really ſenſible.---The judicious Reader is

now

now called upon a ſecond Time to judge of the Soundneſs of your Philoſophy and Divinity in this Point.

If you call expoſing your Blunders, Invectives and Railing, and will not diſtinguiſh between yourſelf, and your bad Cauſe, I cannot help it.---I refer myſelf to the Judgment of others.---Page 43 of my ſecond Letter.---I refer it to the Reader to judge, whether there be either Reaſon or Religion in this Part of your *Review*, that concerns Mr. *Edwards* Sermon, or any Evidence of the Knowledge of God,-- but did not think this an Argument either ſtrong or weak.--- But now I add, Unleſs that the Reader will take Forgery, Falſhood and Miſrepreſentation, which I have clearly proven upon you, for Evidences of theſe.

2*dly*, You alledge in the Paſſages of my Letter referred to, I advance Poſitions of a dangerous and Soul-ruining Tendency, and to be abhorred by all ſerious Chriſtians; and tell, that you have warned from the Pulpit your own Congregation againſt them, as you now do them, and all others who love our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, (you ſhould have added, according to your Principles, *if there be any ſuch*) from the Preſs, *Preface*, Page 9. 10.—This doth not appear ſtrange to me,—ſeeing that the principal Support of your Schiſm is by Calumnies, Slander and Miſrepreſentation, and making a Noiſe, in ſeveral Caſes, about Errors and Corruptions, which are nowhere to be found, but in your own Brains and Books.—I am ſorry that you ſo lightly profane the Name and Ordinance of God, both the Ways you mention;—only you will find, that your doing it from the Pulpit, is as great an Aggravation of your Sin beyond the other, as the poiſoning a Man in the bleſſed Cup, is beyond murdering a Man by an open Aſſault upon the Street;—and yet alas! it is your ordinary, and of ſome others of your Party.—The Reverend Mr. *Ralph Erskine*, in the *Appendix* to *Fraud and Falſhood diſcovered*, hath attacked me upon this

ſame

ſame Head, from Page 48,—53. where indeed there is a ſcarcely to be parallelled Jumble of perverting Scripture, wreſting my Words, falſe Reaſoning, Fraud and Falſhood, as I hope, by the Lord's Aſſiſtance, to make evident.

To proceed diſtinctly, I ſhall lay down, *firſt*, What you charge upon me. *2dly*, What I have really aſſerted, and do aſſert, with the Grounds of it, and its Agreement with all Orthodox Divines. *3dly*, What you aſſert, and muſt aſſert in Contradiction to my Poſitions, and your unfair Reaſoning in both your Performances.

Firſt, The Poſitions of a dangerous and Soul-ruining Tendency, you charge upon me, and the preſent Promoters of Enthuſiaſm, in your ordinary Stile, are laid down, Page 10. Beginning, namely, *That we cannot think of Chriſt, as God-man, without forming to ourſelves ſome Image or Repreſentation of an abſent Man, and that we cannot receive him, as offered in the Goſpel, without ſuch an imaginary Conception of him, or conceiving upon our Imagination ſome Figure of a Man's Body.*—Now, let the Reader obſerve here your unfair Dealing. Let him compare what you here charge upon me, with the Paſſage of my Letter you refer to, P. 11. 12. and ſee if he can find me aſſerting what you charge upon me in theſe Words or Terms. Where do I ſay, that we cannot think of Chriſt as God-man, without forming to ourſelves ſome Image or Repreſentation of an abſent Man?------No Where. You had ſaid in your Review, that to have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt, would be a ſeeing a ſenſible Object.----To ſhew the blundering Nonſenſe of this, I ſaid you are the firſt Philoſopher who ever advanced, that to have an imaginary Idea of an abſent Man, was to ſee a ſenſible Object.—The Reaſon of my Obſervation was, that as we can have no imaginary Idea of any but ſenſible Objects, and therefore can only have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as Man, ſo it ſtill ſuppoſeth that the Object is not preſent but abſent,

ſent, as the Lord Jeſus in his human Nature is;—and therefore I added what you have not thought fit to quote,—"That the Boys in the logical Claſs "can tell you, that by our bodily Senſes we appre-"hend bodily Things preſent, and by our Imagi-"nation we apprehend Things abſent." But this was far from ſaying, that we cannot think upon him as God-man, without thinking upon him as an abſent Man; for we can and often do think upon him, or have an imaginary Idea of him as Man, without thinking of him as abſent, or under that Conſideration:—So that here is one Charge upon me that never enter'd into my Head, much leſs into my Pen. Where do I ſay, that we cannot receive the bleſſed Jeſus *without conceiving upon our Imagination ſome Figure of a Man's Body?*—I neither aſſerted this Propoſition, nor uſed theſe Terms;—for though all theſe Terms of Image, Picture, Repreſentation, are underſtood by Philoſophers and Divines, and are of a good Meaning in the Subject of Imagination, yet they are not underſtood, but miſtaken by the Vulgar: And therefore it was unfair and malicious in you to uſe Terms and Words I had not uſed, and which you knew would be odious to the Vulgar, becauſe not underſtood:—From all this it is evident,—that your doctrinal Teſtimony from the Pulpit is, like your judicial Teſtimony, interperſed with Lies and Miſrepreſentations, as the Reverend Mr. *Currie* hath ſhowen.

I now proceed, 2*dly*, To lay down before the Reader my real POSITIONS in my own Words, upon this Subject.

Firſt POSITION, That we can have no imaginary Idea of ſpiritual Things, ſeeing only corporeal Things are the Objects of that Faculty and Power in Man, called the *Imagination*. This hath been often aſſerted and obſerved.

Second Pos. I aſſerted that we cannot, ought not to have any imaginary Idea of God, Page 9th, 2*d Letter*.—

ter.---"All this ought to be done without any the "least imaginary Idea of God; and yet there can- "not but be imaginary Ideas, tho' not of him, "attending these our Meditations upon him." And many other Places.---Consequently we ought not to have, cannot have justly any imaginary Idea of any of the Persons of the God-head.

Third Pos. I asserted, and do assert, That we cannot think upon Jesus Christ really as he is, God and Man in two distinct Natures, and one Person for ever, without an imaginary Idea of him as Man, or in his human Nature, consisting of a true Body, and a reasonable Soul.---The Grounds and Reasons of this are, That as we would not have a just Conception of the glorious Mediator, if we have not a Conception and Idea of him, as the very true and eternal God, as well as true and real Man; so we cannot have a just Conception of him, if we have not a Conception and Idea of him, as true and real Man, as well as the true and eternal God,---for as much as the Mediator is as really Man as he is God:---And as we ought to form no imaginary Idea of him as he is God, but a pure Conception without any Form of Representation of him as God in our Minds; so we can no more conceive, and have an Idea of him in our Understandings as Man, but what is called an imaginary Idea, or an Idea of him in our Minds, by the Exercise of our Imagination, than we can of *Enoch* or *Elias*, or any other Man, who is now in Heaven: For this Reason, that our Lord's human Nature, and particularly his glorified and super-exalted Body, hath all the essential Properties of any other Body, and no other;---and therefore, if we can never think of any other human Nature, or human Body, through our natural Constitution, and the Nature of Bodies, but by an imaginary Idea, when absent from us, as indeed we cannot, we can never think upon the Mediator as Man, and his Body now in Hea.

Heaven, by any other Idea:----So then when we think upon the Lord Jesus Christ, as he is God and Man in two distinct Natures, and one Person for ever, I must conceive of him to be true and real Man, and this is what is called an imaginary Idea of him: I must further, by a mere Act of my Understanding, conceive of him, as not only Man, but the very true and eternal God.----And *3dly*, I must conceive the Manhood personally united with the God-head, in the Second Person:----If any of these Three be wanting, I have not such an Idea of the Mediator God-Man, as should be.----Sir, You'll please tell the honest well-meaning People, in your next Warning, That the plain *Scotch* of what I asserted here was, that we cannot think upon Jesus Christ, as he really is, God-Man, without thinking of him as Man, as really as God, and that by the Exercise of the same Faculties and Powers, I think and conceive of other Men.

My *Fourth* Position was, That we cannot receive the Lord Jesus Christ, as offered to us in the Gospel, without an imaginary Idea or Conception of him as Man.----Yea further I assert, we cannot assent unto the Gospel concerning his Incarnation, Life, Obedience, Sufferings and Death here, his Burial, Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession in Heaven, and his coming visibly to judge the World at the Last Day, without an imaginary Idea of him, or a Thought and Conception of him, as Man, by these Powers and Faculties God hath given us. Can you ever assent, for Instance, to *Philip.* ii. 7, 8. *Who being in the form of God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in the fashion of a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient to death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him.*----I say, Can you, or any, give the

Assent

Aſſent of Faith to theſe or the like Paſſages, without an imaginary Idea of him as Man.----I aſſert therefore, we cannot go a Step further in Faith to receive him as offered, without ſuch an Idea of him as Man, ſeeing we muſt know him as God-Man, before we can receive him. And can we ever know him as God-Man, without having an Idea and Conception of him as Man, as well as of him as God, unleſs you have a Mind to introduce the Popiſh Faith, to believe what we have no Knowledge nor Idea of?----Judicious *Durham* ſaith, upon the liii. of *Iſaiah*, "There muſt alſo be an underſtanding of this, a conceiving in the Judgment what it is; Folks cannot believe, except they hear, and underſtand what they hear, in ſo far as diſtinctly to fix their Faith on the Thing known."

Theſe were the POSITIONS I had laid down, with theſe Grounds of them: Theſe you have ſlandered as dangerous, and of a Soul-ruining Tendency, and to be abhorred by ſerious Chriſtians.---- To take in here the firſt Branch of the *third* Thing propoſed, what Mr. *Ralph Erskine* and you muſt aſſert, ſeeing you contradict theſe *Poſitions*, is, "That we can think upon Chriſt as God-Man, without any imaginary Idea of him as Man, or in his human Nature, conſiſting of a true Body, and a reaſonable Soul.--,-2*dly*, That we can receive the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, offered unto us as God-Man in the Goſpel, without any Idea or Thought of him as Man;---and that we ought never to think upon him as Man, or have any Idea or Conception of him in his human Nature." Theſe are the Poſitions directly oppoſite to mine, and muſt be yours, who warn againſt mine, as to be abhorred;----And this is indeed what you expreſly aſſert, *Pref.* Page 13. in your *third* Argument:---- *And therefore to aſſert, that we cannot receive Chriſt, as offered in the Goſpel, without an imaginary Conception*

ception of him as Man, has a native Tendency to lead People off from the true Christ in the Word, to a false Christ upon the Imagination.---And Mr. *Ralph Erskine* doth, in the expressest Terms, exclude the human Nature of the glorious Mediator God-Man, from being any Part of the Object of Faith.---Fraud and Falshood, Page 50. *Can that be any Part of the Object of Faith, which is perceptible by every Man's Fancy, and is obvious to natural discerning?*---And argueth all alongst against all Conceptions of Christ as Man, or in his human Nature as *carnal, vain, and unprofitable,* yea *hurtful and hindring to Faith?*---And again,---*To conceive of him as Man, and yet at the same Time to conceive of him, and receive him as God-Man, are still Contradictions,* Page 52.

Before I shew the true State of the Question betwixt you and me, allow me again to observe, That accurately speaking, an imaginary Idea, is that Idea which the Understanding formeth of corporeal Things absent from us, by the Help of the Imagination presenting the Species, or Image of these corporeal Things received and laid up in the Imagination:—For, as it is not our Senses that apprehend corporeal Things present, but our Souls, by the Intervention of our Senses;—so it is not the Imagination that hath what we call the Idea of any corporeal Object absent, but the Soul and Understanding, by the Intervention of the Imagination; according to that Rule, *Oportet intelligentem phantasmata speculari.*

So that the precise State of the Question is, *first,* Not whether that we can, or ought to have, in our thinking upon Jesus Christ the Mediator, and as he is God-man, an imaginary Idea of him, considered as the second Person of the Godhead, or considered in his Divine Nature; for this is agreed among all Hands, that we cannot justly, and should not: But the Question is, Whether, in our thinking upon him as he really is God-man, we may and should

think of him as Man, and in his human Nature, as well as of him as God, and in his Divine Nature? And whether we can think of him really as he is God-man, without ſuch a Conception of him as Man, or, which is the ſame, an imaginary Idea of him as Man?—This is what we affirm, that we may, and ſhould think upon him as Man, and in his human Nature, and that we cannot think of him really as he is God and Man, without this, and it is what, to my great Surpriſe, both of you deny.

2*dly*, The Queſtion between you and me, is not, if we may think upon, and have an imaginary Idea of Jeſus Chriſt as a mere Man, or as Man ſimply, to uſe Mr. *Erskine*'s Words; for this is agreed upon all Hands, we may not; for both you and I expreſly aſſert him to be God-man: But the Queſtion is, Whether our thinking of him as Man, or having an imaginary Idea of him as Man be ſometimes neceſſary, uſeful and profitable to our right Knowledge of him, and Uſe-making of him as Mediator? This is what we have affirmed, and do affirm; and it is what you both have denied.

Laſtly, The Queſtion is not, Whether conceiving of Jeſus Chriſt, or having an imaginary Idea of him as Man, be Faith, or any Part of Faith; for this we never aſſerted it to be, and we are agreed that it is not: But the Queſtion is, Whether the conceiving of Chriſt as Man, or having an imaginary Idea of him as Man, be ſo neceſſary to Faith, as that there can be no ſaving Faith without it? This is what we have affirmed, and do affirm, and what both of you have denied in very ſtrong and extraordinary Terms.

Some of the Grounds of my Poſitions have been already given. Allow me then to open up an extraordinary and amazing Scene to the Reader, in preſenting him with a few Citations from ſome of our principal Divines, aſſerting all I have ſaid, as the great, neceſſary and comfortable Truths of the glorious Goſpel, and conſequently, your oppoſite Propoſitions

poſitions as falſe and heretical.—This may poſſibly let well-meaning People into your Management, and convince them how ready you are to caſt up the moſt ſacred Truths, to maintain your Schiſm, and may poſſibly prevent ſome being led into Hereſy by your Poſitions and Reaſonings.

The firſt I ſhall preſent you with, is a Paſſage from the late learned and godly Mr. *Rutherford*'s *Letters*, 2d *Edit.* 1671, Page 520. *Letter to Mr.* Matthew Mowat.—"I know God is caſten (if I may ſpeak ſo) "in a ſweet Mould and lovely Image, in the Per- "ſon of that Heaven's Jewel, the MAN CHRIST, and "that the Steps of that ſteep Aſcent and Stair to the "Godhead is the Fleſh of Chriſt, the new and li- "ving Way, *and there is Footing for Faith in that "curious Ark of the HUMANITY:* Therein dwel- "leth the Godhead married upon our Humanity. I "would be in Heaven, ſuppoſe I had not another "Errand, but to ſee that dainty golden Ark, and "God perſonally looking out at Ears and Eyes, and "a Body, ſuch as we Sinners have, that I might "wear my ſinful Mouth in Kiſſes on him for ever- "more: And I know all the three bleſſed Perſons "ſhould be well pleaſed, that my Piece of faint "and created Love ſhould firſt couch upon the MAN "CHRIST; I ſhould ſee them all through him."

Now, Sir, judge alſo Reader, How do your and Mr. *Erskine*'s Poſitions agree with Mr. *Rutherford*'s? —How doth Mr. *Erskine*'s ſaying, *That to have an imaginary Idea of his Fleſh and Blood, or human Body, belongs not in the leaſt to Faith, but to Unbelief.—That ſuch Views are the greateſt Lets and Contradictions, inſtead of being Helps and Advantages to Faith.—An imaginary View of the Man doth not help, but rather doth hurt, and hinder the ſaving Sight of the God-Man, and the believing View of the glorious Perſon of our Immanuel, God with us.—That Chriſt's Humanity, which is perceptible by every Man's Fancy, and is obvious to natural Diſcerning, is no*

Part

Part of the Object of Faith.—To conceive of Christ as Man, is indeed no Mystery at all; yea, to conceive of him as Man, and yet at the same Time to conceive of him, and receive him as God-Man, are flat Contradictions.—I say, How do these horrible Propositions agree, with what Mr. *Rutherford* saith, —*That the Steps of that steep Ascent and Stair to the Godhead is the Flesh of Christ, the new and living Way; and there is Footing for Faith in that curious Ark of the Humanity.*—Is this to be a Help or Hindrance to Faith?—Is this to be no Part of the Object of Faith?—How do they agree, with what he saith of casting his Love first upon the MAN CHRIST?

The second Passage is from learned *Charnock*, where speaking of this very Subject, *imaginary Ideas*, Vol. I. Page 124.—where shewing, that we must by no Means conceive of God under a human or corporeal Shape,—He saith, "We may indeed "conceive of Christ as Man, who hath in Heaven "the Vestment of our Nature, and is *Deus figura-* "*tus*, tho' we cannot conceive the Godhead under "a human Shape.—You may compare this with your Positions and mine at your Leisure:—As also, what I have quoted from this same Author, former Part of this *Letter*, Page 8. 9.

3*dly*, To transcribe all that Mr. *Durham* hath upon this Subject, would make this *Letter* a Volume. I shall extract some Propositions he hath in his *Commentary upon the Revelation*, *Edit.* 1660, Page 29.

First, "That our blessed Lord is true Man, having "these Affections and Properties that are natural and "not sinful, truly and really."

2*dly* "That as he is Man, having such Properties, "so he is affected suitable thereto; that is, he hath "a human Affection to, and Sympathy with these "he loveth, *&c.*"

3*dly*, "That he who is Man, is also God,—*&c.*"

4*thly*, "It would be considered, that the Scrip- "ture allows these Considerations of Christ to Be-

"lievers,

" lievers, for helping them up to Communion with " him, and so with God in him; and for strength- " ning them to approach to him with Confidence " upon that Ground."

5*thly*, " As there is an exercising of Faith in God, " and thereby a keeping Communion with him, so " there is a proportionable Sympathising, Heart- " warming, and Bowel-moving Affection allowed " us, even towards the VERY MAN CHRIST, as one " hath to a dear Friend, or most loving Husband; " that so, in a Word, we may love him who is Man, " as he who is Man loves us."

Hence, 6*thly*, " As we have most Access to CON- " CEIVE of Christ's Love to us, who is Man, so " we are in the greater Capacity to vent our Love " to him, and to have our Bowels kindled upon " the Consideration of his being Man;—so the Ob- " ject is most suited, to be beloved by us, in his " condescending to be a Brother to us,—*&c.*"

And afterwards—" On whom (*Christ*) our Affec- " tions and Faith also may have the more sensible " Footing, by the Consideration of his human Af- " fections." Let the Reader read, if he please, the whole 18th and 19th Pages.

Page 412, " The more spiritual any Object be, " the less do we conceive of it; and when the Scrip- " ture speaketh of the Lord's Bowels and Sympathy, " that is not easily reached or conceived; but when " we have the Bowels or Sympathy of a true Man " spoken of, we are more able to know that, and " reach what it is, and so are more ready to be af- " fected with the Consolation that suiteth so with us."

Page 413. " Faith would not only respect Christ " simply as Intercessor, but as an Intercessor who is " Man in our Nature, who hath Experience of In- " firmities, and tender human Sympathy towards " us.—See the two foresaid Pages throughout."

Can there be any Thing more expressly opposite to all these heretical Propositions you and Mr. *Erskine* have

have advanced, and to lead People to a Regardleſs-neſs and Neglect of the human Nature of Jeſus Chriſt, according to which he is Mediator, as well as according to his Divine Nature,—and all out of a Deſign to faſten ſome Error upon me, where I was aſſerting that very Truth, all Orthodox Divines, before me, have aſſerted?—I ſhall forbear to adduce any more Divines, unleſs a new Call be for them.

Having then given a fair State of the Queſtion, and having ſhewn my Agreement and your Diſagreement with the greateſt and moſt orthodox, yea reforming Divines,--I proceed to conſider the Arguments brought againſt my Poſitions;-- and ſhall begin with yours, as Reaſon ſhould, ſeeing you have a laſting Claim to have led Mr. *Erskine* and others into this pitiful Scrape.—I hope they will not detain us long.

The firſt Part of your firſt Argument makes nothing againſt me, which is thus: "Jeſus Chriſt, tho' "he be truly Man, yet he is not mere Man, and there-"fore an imaginary Idea of him as Man cannot be an "imaginary Idea of that Perſon who is God-man.'--All this is Truth; but I never aſſerted that an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as Man, was or could be an imaginary Idea of that Perſon who is God-Man, or any other Idea of him, or that it is poſſible to form any Likeneſs or Image of that glorious Perſon who is God-Man,—but aſſerted the contrary; and ſo your Argument and Citation maketh nothing againſt me, and you may lay it up untill an Adverſary caſt up, againſt whom you may uſe it.—You proceed in your Argument to ſhew that we can form no Repreſentation of him, (I underſtand you in our Minds, tho' *Durham* you quote is ſpeaking of Extrernal Repreſentations by Picture or Image) either in his human or in his Divine Nature.—As to his Divine Nature I aſſerted the ſame in my *ſecond Letter* to you, that we can have no imaginary Idea of God;—and ſo it hath nothing ado with the preſent Queſtion.—What you ſay as to the Humanity of the glorious Mediator

in

in Preface Page 11. *The Reaſon why it is impoſſible to form any Repreſentation even of the human Nature of Chriſt, is plain; becauſe the Heavens do contain his human Nature, now glorified beyond all our Conception, and there is no Deſcription of his bodily Likeneſs or Similitude, in the Word.*

Here what you aſſert is, That it is impoſſible to form any Repreſentation of the human Nature of Chriſt.—If you mean by this an external Repreſentation, of which Mr. *Durham* only ſpeaks, I have nothing to do with this Controverſy here;—but if you mean by it, that it is impoſſible for us to form any Idea in our Minds, by the Help and Aſſiſtance of our Imagination, of the human Nature of Chriſt, as we do in other like Caſes;—then I ſay, your Aſſertion is both falſe and heretical;—and the two Reaſons you give for it, are far from proving it.--Not the 1ſt, *becauſe the Heavens do contain his human Nature, now glorified beyond all our Conception.*—For tho' we cannot, becauſe of this, have a ſuitable and adequate Conception of the Glory of his human Nature; yet we ought to raiſe our Minds to the higheſt Conception of his glorified Humanity we can. For Inſtance to repreſent the Glory of his Body as in the Transfiguration, which we may do well, becauſe of the particular Deſcription; and after all to conceive in our Unſtanding that he is to us now inconceivably more glorious than all this.—For this ſame very Reaſon, if it hold here, I can form no Idea or Repreſentation of *Enoch* or *Elias*, now bodily in Heaven, becauſe the heavenly Glory, even in their Caſe, is ſuch as hath not entred into the Heart of Man,—and conſequently I cannot believe they are bodily in Heaven, ſeeing I can never believe what I can have no Conception or Idea of,—which holds alſo in the Caſe of the glorified Humanity of the bleſſed Jeſus;—conſequently alſo I can take none of theſe Encouragements from his Humanity now glorified in Heaven,---Mr. *Durham* ſpeaks of,—if it be impoſſible for me, upon this Account, to

conceive

conceive of him as Man; becauſe my Conception of him is not adequate, and takes in his Glory in its utmoſt Length.

As to your *ſecond* Reaſon, why we can have no Conception or imaginary Idea of our Lord's human Nature, *becauſe we have no Deſcription of his bodily Likeneſs and Similitude in the Word.*—Tho' this is a good Reaſon, as Mr. *Durham* makes Uſe of it, why no Statue or external Picture can be called the Statue or Picture of Jeſus Chriſt; yet it is not ſo in the Caſe between you and me:—For it is not required to a Conception or an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as Man, that I conceive or have an imaginary Idea of his Body, of ſuch a Stature, of ſuch Proportion and Lineaments, as were the exact Stature, Proportion and Lineaments of the Body of Jeſus Chriſt: For, if this were ſo, I never could have a Conception or imaginary Idea of any Man, or corporal Thing which I have never ſeen, or had exactly deſcribed to me; which is contrary to all Fact and Experience.—For this ſame Reaſon we can have no Conception or imaginary Idea of *Peter*, *John*, *Nathaniel*, *Auguſtus Caſar*, *Herod*, or any other ſuch, whoſe bodily Likeneſs and Similitude are not deſcribed to us.—There is no more required in this Caſe, than an Idea or Conception of a human Nature, conſiſting of all its eſſential Parts, abſtractly from any particular Form and Likeneſs,—as we do, and muſt do in all ſuch Caſes.—We can have an imaginary Idea of *John* fiſhing or lying in our Saviour's Boſom; tho' I neither conceive him to be tall or ſhort, of a ruddy or dark Complexion, fat or lean:—So that it is no ways neceſſary to our having an imaginary Idea of any abſent Man, that I know his exact Likeneſs, there being no Want of it in this Caſe; an univerſal Idea, applied to the Particulars, with other Circumſtances taken in by the Imagination or Underſtanding, as the Nature of the Thing requires, being all that is needful here.—*Turretin* upon the ſe-

cond

cond Commandment, if you had looked unto him, he would have ſhewed you,—that there is no Conſequence here;—that we cannot draw a Picture, or make an outward Image of a Thing, therefore we can form no Picture, Idea or Image of it upon our Minds.

As to your *ſecond* Argument,—to keep to your Words, *That it is expreſly forbidden to form any true Image or imaginary Idea of Chriſt as God-Man, as groſs Idolatry*, Deut. iv. 14. 16. It doth not affect any Thing I have ſaid,—who ſay, that we may have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as he is Man, but cannot have an imaginary Idea of him as he is God, or his Perſon.—I never ſaid that it was poſſible to form any true Image or imaginary Idea of Chriſt as God-Man,—as your Second, Mr. *Erskine*, expreſly acknowledgeth, Page 53. *The Object of that Idea being Man and not God, according to Mr.* Robe's *Conceſſion*, Pag. 12.—and therefore your Argument is not againſt me.—Allow me only to obſerve to you, your Inaccuracy in writing;—you ſay it is impoſſible to form any true Image of Chriſt as God-man, which is Truth;—and you add, this is expreſly forbidden.—To make any Image of him the ſecond Perſon, or of God, is indeed expreſly forbidden;—but to forbid to make a true Image, would be to forbid an Impoſſibility,—neither is it forbidden as groſs Idolatry. To worſhip ſuch an Image is the Idolatry forbidden.—The making the Image is forbidden upon another Account.—We do not charge the *Lutherans* with groſs Idolatry, becauſe they make ſuch Images, tho' we do the Papiſts who worſhip them.—You ſhould really cauſe ſome to reviſe what you write before you publiſh it.

Your *third* Argument,—That *to have an imaginary Conception of Chriſt, as God, or of the Perſon of Chriſt*, (for this is what you muſt ſpeak of, by your ſaying it would be a direct Breach of the ſecond Commandment) *deſtroys and overthrows the very Nature of Faith*,—makes as little againſt any Thing I have

ſaid;—neither doth it follow from this, that to have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt in his Divine Nature, or in his Perſon, is deſtructive of the Nature of Faith. That therefore to aſſert, that we cannot receive Chriſt as offered in the Goſpel, without an imaginary Conception of him as Man, has a native Tendency to lead People off from the true Chriſt in the Word, to a falſe Chriſt upon the Imagination;—this is what you have not made the leaſt Eſſay to prove, and what you ſhall never be able to do.—It is impoſſible to have any true imaginary Idea of God, or of any of the Perſons of the Godhead; 'tis unlawful to admit of any:—But it is poſſible to have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt in his human Nature, and 'tis not poſſible that we can think upon the human Nature of the true Chriſt in the Word, without a Conception of him, or an Idea of him in the Mind, by the Help and Aſſiſtance of that Faculty, called the *Imagination*; which is what is all alongſt called an *imaginary Idea*.—And this is as true a Chriſt, as Chriſt in the Word; if it be an Idea of him, as held forth in the Word.—For Inſtance, the true Chriſt is held forth to us in that Word, 1 *Tim.* ii. 5. *For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Chriſt Jeſus.*—Upon this Text Mr. *Flavel* writes, "I "doubt not, but he is deſcribed by his human Na- "ture in this Place, not only becauſe in this Nature "he paid that Ranſom; (which he ſpeaks of in the "Words immediately following) but eſpecially for "the drawing of Sinners to him; ſeeing he is the "Man Chriſt Jeſus. One that cloathed himſelf in "their own Fleſh; and to ENCOURAGE THE "FAITH OF BELIEVERS, *&c.*" Now, can we receive Chriſt in this Word, can the Faith of Believers be encouraged, by his being deſcribed in this Place, in his human Nature, without a Conception or imaginary Idea of him as Man in our Minds.—If the Repreſentation of Jeſus Chriſt in the Word, in his human Nature, hath no Tendency to draw People off

off from the true Christ, to a false Christ; if it is not destructive; but encouraging to the Faith of Believers; can the Representation of him in his human Nature in our Minds, have such a Tendency, or be destructive to Faith; seeing the Representation in the Word, we speak of, can never encourage the Faith of Believers, without the Representation of this on the Understanding, or the imaginary Idea we assert.--Thus your arguing hath not been in the least against me, or any other Promoter of this blessed Work.—My Assertion was, That we cannot think upon Christ really, as he is God and Man, in two distinct Natures, and one Person, or receive him as such, without an imaginary Idea of him as Man, or in his human Nature. Instead of bringing Reasons and Arguments against this, you endeavour to prove, that we cannot have an imaginary Idea of him as God, or his Divine Person, wherein you and I are all alongst agreed;—and yet you cunningly draw in the Conclusion, as if you had been arguing all alongst against the Possibility or Lawfulness of an imaginary Idea of the human Nature of the lovely Jesus.—This is not to act like even an honest Pagan, much less like what you give out yourself to be.

I now proceed to consider what the Reverend Mr. *Ralph Erskine* hath said in this same Argument, in his forequoted *Appendix*, from the 48th to the 53d Pag. Here there is a Flood of Words rolling hither and thither, without the steady Direction of Art and Reason.—Here there is more of the Holy Scripture perverted and profaned, than ever I saw anywhere else in so little Bounds.—And here there is the most cunning and sophistical Dealing, that hath been used, to cover and misrepresent the Truth.—I shall give Instances of all this,—and hope the Reader will carry alongst with him the true State of the Question between these Brethren and me.

First, Notice, That he speaks of imaginary Ideas, as if they were the same with Ideas of spiritual Things,

---in

—in the very Title-page; *It is an Appendix, relating especially to imaginary Ideas of ſpiritual Things.*—Page 47. *The Subject of imaginary Ideas, or the Images of ſpiritual Things repreſented to the Fancy,*—Page 57. Imaginary Ideas, or the Images of ſpiritual Things, Chriſt, Heaven or Hell, repreſented to the Fancy.—Hath he not been told again and again, as well as in the Deſcription I gave of an imaginary Idea, that corporeal and not ſpiritual Things are the Object of theſe Ideas.—Was this to clear up the Controverſy, or to miſlead the Reader?—Did he this through Ignorance or Deſign?—Through Ignorance he could not; for Page 51. he ſays, *That Part of Chriſt that is viſible, was the Object of Senſe on Earth, and is the Object of Viſion in Heaven, and may be the Object of any Man's Fancy or Imagination.*—I forbear to inſiſt upon the Nonſenſe of *the Image of ſpiritual Things repreſented to the Fancy.* While we are ſpeaking all alongſt of the Images, or Species repreſented to the Underſtanding by the Imagination.

To come to his Reaſoning, ſuch as it is, he ſaith, *firſt*, That *an imaginary Idea of a crucified Chriſt, a Man upon the Croſs, is no better than a Popiſh Crucifix, and mere mental Idolatry.*---The only Proof of this is,---*I think*,---which I doubt not will be enough to ſome.---And tho' *I think not*, be all the Anſwer this deſerves, yet I ſhall be at a little Pains to ſhew Mr. *Erskine*, and any of his Party who may read this, without the Leave of their Guides, that his, *I think*, is not always to be depended upon.---*Turretine* would have told him in his Anſwer to a *Lutheran* Objection, *viz.* That it is no more unlawful to make an external Image of Jeſus Chriſt, than to form an Idea or Image of him in our Minds; that there is a great Difference between theſe Two: For a mental Image, or imaginary Idea, is abſolutely neceſſary, becauſe we cannot conceive of any Thing, without ſome Shape or Idea formed in our Mind;-- and this Image is always accompanied with ſuch a Spirit of Diſcretion,

tion, whereby we ſeparate that which is true from that which is falſe, that there is no Danger of Idolatry.---But that, to wit, external Images, ſuch as a Crucifix, is a voluntary Work expreſly forbidden of God, and attended with the greateſt Hazard of Idolatry. — Can you, or any Man think of, explain, read or hear the Hiſtory of Chriſt's Sufferings and Death upon the Croſs, without an imaginary Idea of a crucified Jeſus,---or Chriſt in his human Nature hanging, ſuffering and dying upon the Croſs? Anſwer this directly, without ſilly and childiſh Evaſions.---Can you have ſuch an Idea of him, without your Imagination, and the actual Exerciſe of it, preſenting to your Underſtanding the Figure of a Croſs? *&c.*---This is what all Men of Senſe will tell you.---Hear that good Man *Iſaac Ambroſe, looking to Jeſus*, Page 357, "But thy Jeſus was crowned with Thorns, "and ſceptred with a Reed, and that Reed was ta-"ken out of his Hands, to beat the Crown of Thorns "into his Head; and beſides, thy Jeſus was whip-"ped with Cords, and Rods, and little Chains of "Iron, that from his Shoulders to the Soles of his "Feet, there was no Part free; and being now in "this Plight, thou art called in to behold the MAN: "Doſt thou ſee him? IS THY IMAGINATION "STRONG? Canſt thou conſider him at preſent, "as if thou hadſt a View of this very Man?"---To ſave the Trouble of looking back to the firſt Paſſage cited from *Charnock*,---hear him, Vol. II. Page 750, ſpeaking of Chriſt's Sufferings.---"Here we may ſee "the Sufferings of his Body, his Pains upon the "Croſs; and here *Fancy* may work about the uncon-"ceivable Troubles of his Soul.---Here *Fancy* may "repreſent the piercing of his Temples by the "Thorns, and the Dints made in his Body."---Did theſe great Men think, that an imaginary Idea of a crucified Chriſt, is no better than a Popiſh Crucifix, and mental Idolatry.---It is hard to have for Antagoniſts, Men who care not what extravagant Things they

they ſay, becauſe they know many of their own Party will ſwallow it all; and they have no Regard to the reſt of Mankind what they think of them.

Mr. *Erskine*'s ſecond Head of Arguments is, That *an imaginary Idea of Chriſt is not ſaving Faith, is no Part of it, nor included in it;—and therefore we can receive him as God-Man offered in the Goſpel, without any imaginary Idea of him as Man.*—Here he is at great Pains, by heaping together a great many Scriptures,---and other Arguments, to prove, that an imaginary Idea of Chriſt in his human Nature, is not ſaving Faith, nor included in it, *&c.*—But he may reſerve all theſe Arguments untill he find an Adverſary of *Abelard*'s Opinion, who maintained, that Faith was nothing but a ſtrong Fancy.—I never ſaid, that an imaginary Idea of Chriſt, in his human Nature, was Faith, or included in it;—but that we cannot receive Chriſt, as God-Man, without it.—It doth not follow, that becauſe it is not Faith, therefore Faith may be without it, or that it is not neceſſarily required in it.----Knowledge is neceſſary to Faith, we cannot receive Chriſt without it, and yet it is not Faith;—it may be where Faith is not, tho' Faith can never be where it is not.—And if Mr. *Erskine*, or you Brother *Fiſher*, can take it up, the imaginary Conception or Idea of Chriſt in his human Nature, belongs to that Knowledge of the Object of Faith, which is neceſſarily preſuppoſed to Faith.—Some of the *Mediums*, or Arguments he maketh Uſe of to prove, that an imaginary Idea of Chriſt is not Faith, are horrid and heretical,—ſuch as, that the human Nature of Chriſt is no Part of the Object of Faith, becauſe it is the Object of the Imagination or Fancy, Page 50. *Can that be any Part of the Object of Faith, which is perceptible by the Fancy of every Man, and is obvious to natural diſcerning?* And then proceeds dreadfully to abuſe ſeveral Scriptures;---*Nothing ſenſible, nothing corporeal, nothing viſible, can properly be the Object of that Faith, which*

which is the Evidence of Things not ſeen, Heb. xi. 1. Pag. 51.—where he evidently aſſerts Chriſt's human Nature to be no Part of the Object of Faith, and that it can be no Part of it, becauſe 'tis the Object of every Man's Fancy or Imagination, now when it is abſent, becauſe it is ſenſible, corporeal, viſible.—How dreadful is this?—I frequently ſaid, ſince this Schiſm began, it was ſo groundleſs and unreaſonable, I was afraid it would iſſue in ſome Hereſy;—and now alas! it ſeems to be broaching.—It doth not pertain to this preſent Argument further to argue againſt it here:—Only let the Reader conſider, that a whole Chriſt, in his Perſon and both his Natures, is the Object of Faith, and offered to us in the Goſpel.—Hear Mr. *Charnock*, Vol. II. "'Tis "not a Faith ſimply in his God-head that is requi-"red by him; for ſo he is the Object of Faith in "the ſame Manner as the Deity is; nor ſimply in "his Manhood; for ſo he is no more the Object "of Faith than another Man may be; but Chriſt in "his Perſon God-man."—*Flavel*, Vol. I. Page 172. "He that takes Chriſt for a mere Man,—or diveſts "him of his human Nature,—can never receive "him a-right." The Scriptures Mr. *Erskine* brings to prove, that Faith is a believing upon God thro' Chriſt, who ſent Chriſt;---and that Chriſt, as Man ſimply, is not the Object of Faith, but of Senſe and Fancy;---doth not in the leaſt ſay, that his human Nature is not a Part of the Object of Faith, as perſonally united with his Divine,---tho' it be not the Object of Faith ſimply in itſelf.—If Mr. *Erskine* here contradict himſelf, it doth not leſſen the Charge of this groſs Error upon him, That the HUMAN NATURE of the GLORIOUS MEDIATOR is no Part of the OBJECT OF FAITH.—Page 51. He ſaith, *That Part of Chriſt that is viſible, was the Object of Senſe on Earth, and is the Object of Viſion in Heaven, and may be the Object of any Man's Fancy or Imagination; but never was, nor never will be the*

Object

Object of Faith, but as the inviſible God is ſeen therein or thereby.---Here Mr. *Erskine* inſinuates, that the human Nature of Jeſus Chriſt is the Object of Faith, as the inviſible God is ſeen therein or thereby; and ſo ſay I:—But doth not Mr. *Erskine* by this contradict what he hath ſaid before, *That that Part of Chriſt which is perceptible by the Fancy of every Man, and is obvious to natural diſcerning, cannot be any Part of the Object of Faith*;---is there not here a Contraction in Terms?----Let Mr. *Erskine* tell us, if that Part of Chriſt that is viſible, and was the Object of Senſe when he was upon the Earth, was not the Object of Faith then, as perſonally united to the Son of God, and, as the inviſible God, was ſeen therein or thereby?---Was it not ſo to *Thomas?* John xx. 29.---*Jeſus ſaith unto him, Thomas, becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, thou haſt believed.*---Was it not ſo to all other Believers, who received him and believed upon him then?----And if it was ſo,---as Mr. *Erskine* alſo inſinuates here,----how is this conſiſtent with what he aſſerts again and again, That what is the Object of Senſe can by no Means be the Object of Faith; that no ſenſible Object can be the Object of Faith:----That nothing a natural or carnal Man can conceive, or have any Knowlede or Idea of, can be the Object of Faith:---For theſe are his expreſs Words Page 50. *Nay, the Things of God that are taught by the Word and Spirit of God, are indeed the Objects of Faith; but the Things of Man, which a natural Man can receive, and a carnal Man can diſcern, are the Objects of Senſe, and of vain unprofitable Imagination,* whereby he wreſts and perverts 1 *Cor.* ii. 14.----How is it further conſiſtent, with what he ſaith, *That nothing ſenſible, nothing corporeal, nothing viſible can properly be the Object of that Faith, which is the evidence of things not ſeen,* Heb. xi. 1. *And looks not to the things that are ſeen, but the things that are not ſeen,* 2 Cor. iv. 18.---- Theſe are evident Contradictions.------Was not the bleſſed

bleſſed Body of our dear Redeemer, when preſent to the Senſes of his believing Diſciples upon the Earth, ſenſible, viſible, corporeal, perceptible and conceivable by natural carnal Men, as much as by Believers; and was it not then as much a Part of the Mediator God-man, and the Object of Faith then, as it is now.----Cannot carnal and natural Men diſcern and conceive, not only the Propoſitions of the Word, concerning the human Nature of Jeſus Chriſt, but the other Propoſitions of the Goſpel, by their rational Faculties, as they can conceive of, and diſcern other Things; and are theſe Things therefore not the Things of the Spirit of God, and the Objects of Faith, becauſe a natural carnal Man can conceive and diſcern them rationally, tho' not ſpiritually? Can nothing be the Object of Faith which is viſible, or which can be known by our Senſes or Reaſon? Cannot the ſame Thing be the Object of Reaſon and of Revelation, or diſcovered to us both by Reaſon and Revelation? as the Creation of the World, and many other Things?---- As to the two Scriptures Mr. *Erskine* abuſeth, I ſhall anſwer him in the Words of *Arnoldus*,----upon *John* xx. 27. *Lux in tenebris*,----that the Reader may ſee from others than from me, how much Mr. *Erskine* tortures and wreſts the Scripture to the Injury of Truth,----and how he advanceth here, what never Man of Senſe or Reaſon advanced before.---That the ſame Thing cannot be the Object of Senſe, of Reaſon and of Faith. Mr. *Arnold* propoſeth this ſeeming Contradiction,—how it can be ſaid, *becauſe thou haſt ſeen me, Thomas, thou haſt believed*, ſeeing *faith is the evidence of things not ſeen?* Heb. xi. 1.—And according to *Auguſtine*, What is Faith? To believe what thou doſt not ſee.---To this he anſwereth, "What I know "by natural Knowledge, or perceive by Sight or "any other Senſe, that very Thing may be made "known to me by Divine Teſtimony or Revelation, "—and ſo I can alſo believe that Thing; becauſe,

" to believe is nothing elſe, than to aſſent to a cer-
" tain Truth, which, and becauſe God hath reveal-
" ed it, altho' it be alſo known to me ſome other
" Way. So *Thomas*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles,
" at once ſaw and believed Chriſt's Sufferings, dead
" and revived, *&c.* Whence I anſwer to the Words
" of the Apoſtle, and *Auguſtine* objected, that they
" ſpeak not of all, but only the chief and more dif-
" ficult Objects of Faith, ſuch as the Holy Trinity,
" the Incarnation, the heavenly Glory, and the
" like, which fall not under our Senſes; but, as to
" the other Objects of Faith, altho' we have evident
" Notice of them by other Means; yet it is ob-
" ſcure, in Compariſon of what we have by Faith,
" becauſe Divine Revelation ſuperadds a greater
" Certainty to natural Knowledge and Senſation."---
Much might be ſaid upon this Subject; but this is ſufficient.

His *third* Head of Arguments, That we can think of Chriſt really as he is, God-man, and receive him as ſuch, without any imaginary Idea, or which is the ſame, any Thought and Conception of him, as Man, or in his human Nature, in our Minds, by the Aſſiſtance of our Imagination, and that we ought to have no ſuch Thought, Conception or Idea of him is, That all ſuch Thoughts of Chriſt are *carnal, fleſhly, a knowing him after the fleſh, ſuch as the Jews had of eating his fleſh*, John vi. *A carnal Conception of his Humanity*.---This he confidently aſſerts; but doth he bring any Proof of it.---In a moſt ſly Manner, he brings a great many Scriptures to prove, that carnal Conceptions and Views of Chriſt are contrary to Faith, and forbidden, which is not the Thing controverted; but there is not the leaſt Syllable to prove, what he ſo confidently aſſerts, that an Idea of Chriſt in the Underſtanding, by the Help of the Faculty of our Imagination, is carnal and fleſhly.---For Inſtance, End of Page 48, he argues, *To have any carnal Notion or imaginary Idea*

of

of his Fleſh and Blood, or human Body, belongs not in the leaſt to Faith, but rather to Unbelief, and is a vain and unprofitable Imagination,----where he ſlyly would make, as if a carnal Notion and imaginary Idea of Chriſt's Fleſh and Blood, or human Body, were the ſame Thing; and this he doth through and through, without offering the leaſt Proof, and ſo endeavouring to impoſe upon his unskilful and unwary Reader.—When he gives any Proof of this it ſhall be anſwered; but this I do not expect he will do in Haſte:—For all that he ſaith, againſt carnal fleſhly Views of Chriſt, doth not ſo much as come near the preſent Queſtion, and ſaith nothing againſt ſuch Idea or Conception of our Lord's Humanity, as is according to the Word, and which we cannot have, but by the Help of our Imagination, as hath been ſo often mentioned.

Mr. *Erskine*'s *fourth* Head of Arguments is, *That an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as Man, and in his human Nature, is ſo far from being helpful to Faith, that it is hurtful and prejudicial to it, and is Unbelief.*—This indeed is direct Oppoſition and Arguing, if his Evidence and Proof of this be good, which I proceed to conſider.—His firſt Argument to prove this is, Page 50, *Does an imaginary View of the Man help, or rather does it not hurt and hinder the ſaving View of the God-Man, and the believing View of the glorious Perſon of our Immanuel, God with us?* To which I anſwer, It doth not hurt and hinder, but help the ſaving View of the God-Man, and the believing View of the glorious Perſon of our Immanuel, God with us.—So thought Mr. *Rutherford* and Mr. *Durham*, as cited above,—and all others who underſtood what they ſaid, or ſaid what they underſtood.---Mr. *Erskine* adds, *The word was made fleſh; but imaginary Ideas of that Fleſh are unprofitable Fancies; we do not believe, till we behold his Glory, as the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth,* John ii. 14.---I anſwer, Tho' we

do

do not believe till we behold his Glory, as the only begotten of the Father, yet an imaginary Idea of the Fleſh is no unprofitable Fancy, becauſe we can have no Underſtanding of that Propoſition, *the word was made fleſh*, without it.---He adds, *To ſee Chriſt ſavingly, and without a Deluſion, is not to ſee Fleſh, but God manifeſted in the Fleſh*, 1 Tim. iii. 18.---I anſwer, Tho' it be not to ſee Fleſh only, yet we cannot ſee him, God manifeſted in the Fleſh, without ſeeing Fleſh, or an Idea and Conception of that Fleſh in which God is manifeſted.

The *ſecond* Proof ſeems to be, Page 50, *The Fancy that terminates on the Fleſh, is not only vain and unprofitable, but pernicious and prejudicial to the Faith of God's Operation, which coming from God, leads to God, and cannot terminate upon Chriſt himſelf, but upon God in Chriſt.*---And to the ſame Purpoſe, Page 51, *In the Act of receiving of Chriſt as God-Man, to have* (that Mr. *Robe* calls) *an imaginary Idea of him as Man, is to believe and not to believe, it is to receive the Perſon of Chriſt, and yet to divide the Perſon of Chriſt, to receive the God-Man is Faith, but to have an imaginary Idea of him as Man, is not Faith but Unbelief; for as Man ſimply, he is not the Object of Faith, but of Senſe and Fancy;---otherwiſe, why does Mr.* Robe *ſpeak of his being revealed and offered as God-Man, and of receiving him as offered; and yet thereupon ſay, Can you then juſtly think upon him, without an imaginary Idea of him as Man, ſince he cannot extend that Idea to the Perſon of the God-Man.*— And again, *That imaginary Idea, that cannot think of him juſtly, but only of the Fleſh that profiteth nothing, muſt be a very ill Neighbour, yea, Neck-break to Faith, which will have nothing to do with a half Chriſt; but conceives of, receives and matches with the whole Perſon of our Immanuel.*— To the ſame Purpoſe,--Page 53, *The Object of that Idea being Man, and not God, according to Mr.* Robe's *Conceſſion*, Page 12, *one cannot but, the Moment he hath*

hath that Idea, think upon a false Christ, according to Mr. Fisher's *Assertion; because he thinks only upon a Man, and indeed his imaginary Ideas can lead him no higher.*---The whole Argument delivered in such a Flood and Variety of Words here, and so much harped upon, is precisely this, That an imaginary Idea can never carry us further, in conceiving of Christ who is both God and Man in two distinct Natures and one Person for ever, than a Conception or Idea of him in his human Nature, and therefore can never help us, but hurt us in conceiving or thinking upon him as God-Man, or in receiving a whole Christ, seeing an imaginary Idea hath for its Object only the half of Christ his Manhood.----Here is precisely the whole Strength of his Argument.

To this I answer, *first*, We may warrantably have an Idea or Conception of either of the Natures of Christ, and think upon either of them, without thinking upon, or having an Idea of the other at the same Time, and yet that Idea and Conception be just and true, and not false.---I may think upon Christ as God, without any Thought that Moment of his Manhood, and yet do not think upon a false Christ, or separating his Godhead from his Manhood; and consequently, upon the other Hand, I may think upon Christ as Man, or which is the same, have an imaginary Idea of him as Man, without thinking that Moment upon him as he is God, or separating his Manhood from his Godhead, and thinking upon a false Christ.---The Attributes of God are himself,—and yet I do not think upon a false God, when I think upon his Eternity, without thinking upon his Immensity; when I think upon his Omnipotence, without thinking upon his Omniscience; because my finite Mind and Capacity can do no other.----This is no Error, but Imperfection in my Way of thinking.

2*dly*, If we should have such an Idea of Christ as Man, as to conceive him to be a Man merely and no more, so as to exclude his Godhead: And

if

if our imaginary Idea of him excluded his being more than Man, this would indeed be ſo far from helping to a right and juſt Conception of him, and to Faith on him, that it would altogether hinder it:---But this is ſo far from being pretended, that it is abhorred,---tho' Mr. *Erskine*'s arguing goes much upon this Suppoſition.

3*dly*, To anſwer directly; tho' an imaginary Idea of Chriſt can extend no farther than the human Nature of the Mediator, yet it is helpful to our thinking upon him juſtly, and to the receiving him as God-man, in ſo much as it goes as far as it can; and where it ends, the Underſtanding proceeds to conceive of him by a different Way of conceiving, and without the Help of any Species preſented from the Imagination, as in the firſt Caſe: So the Idea we have of the Mediator God-man in two Natures and one Perſon, when it is adequate, as the Subject is capable to have of the Object, is not a ſimple but complex Idea, conſiſting of Ideas diſtinct and different in their Natures, as the two Natures in the glorious Mediator.--I muſt by one Idea think of him as Man, by another as God, and by a third as God and Man perſonally united.---Now, is that Kind of Idea, whereby I conceive of Chriſt as Man, hurtful, becauſe it cannot think of him as God, but muſt leave the Underſtanding to do it, and go on with conceiving of him as God, and on his Perſon, without any imaginary Idea;---it helps in going as far as it can go, and which if it did not go, I could not think upon the Mediator as God-man, becauſe I would not think upon him as Man:---And therefore tho' a Perſon, by his imaginary Idea, thinks only upon the Manhood of Chriſt, yet he doth not think upon a falſe Chriſt, ſeeing he doth not think him Man only and no more.---And, as to the complex Idea of the Mediator, the Underſtanding is ſo quick, as it needs not many Moments to force it.---From all this the Reader will ſee the Poorneſs of Mr. *Erskine*'s

ſophiſti-

ſophiſtical Quibling:---The following Similie will illuſtrate this a little.---Man conſiſts of Soul and Body,—the Soul, being a ſpiritual Subſtance, is not conceived by any imaginary Idea; but the Underſtanding muſt conceive of it by a ſimple and pure Act of its own:—But the ſame Underſtanding conceives of the Body, when out of Sight by an imaginary Idea, which cannot extend unto the Soul; and yet that imaginary Idea, tho' it can extend no further than the Body, is not only helpful, but neceſſary to think upon any particular Man; becauſe we can have no Idea of the whole Man without it.

From all this it is eaſy to anſwer Mr. *Erskine*'s Queſtion, Page 52. *Hence one might ask Mr.* Robe, *Can he, or any Man elſe, have an imaginary Idea of Chriſt as Man, and yet that ſame Moment think upon him really as he is God-Man?* To which I anſwer,—We both can and muſt;—For we cannot think upon him really as he is God-Man without it, ſeeing it makes a Part of the Idea or Conception of him as God-Man; and if it were wanting that Moment, we would only think of him as God, and not as Man alſo.—As for what followeth immediately, it is too deep for me to ſee the Reaſon contained in it;—only I never ſaid an imaginary Idea was either Faith, or wrapt in with Faith; but that it was neceſſary to Faith, as far as it is neceſſary that we have ſome Conception of what we believe.—And if Mr. *Erskine* ſet up for a Faith of what we can have no Conception of, it is the ſame, and no better, than the blind and implicite Faith of the *Papiſts*.—How an imaginary Idea of the Mediator's human Nature, according to the Diſcovery of it in the Word, for this muſt always be, is Unbelief, which Mr. *Erskine* hath aſſerted again and again, I muſt leave to him to explain when he gets Leiſure; for, at preſent, I cannot make Senſe of it.

What Mr. *Erskine* adds in this Page is amazing,—he applies theſe Words of our Saviour, *The fleſh*

that

that profiteth nothing, to Chriſt as Man, or his human Nature, which is not only a perverting the Meaning of that Scripture, but a blaſphemous Application of it.—The Words, they are found *John* vi. 63. This is their plain and only Meaning,—to eat Chriſt's Fleſh only as the *Capernamites* underſtood him, can profit nothing, either to the Comfort of the Soul, or the Reſurrection of the Body.—How blaſphemous is it to ſpeak of our Lord's Humanity as that which profiteth nothing? Tho' it would not profit us to eat his Fleſh with our Teeth, yet is it not infinitely profitable to us otherwiſe?—Our larger Catechiſm, in Anſwer to that Queſtion, Why was it neceſſary that the Mediator ſhould be Man? ſaith, It was requiſite that the Mediator ſhould be Man, that he might advance our Nature,—perform Obedience to the Law,—ſuffer,—and make Interceſſion for us in our Nature,—having a Fellow-feeling of our Infirmities, that *we might receive the adoption of ſons*,—and have Comfort and Acceſs with Boldneſs unto the Throne of Grace.—Are theſe glorious Fruits and Benefits no Profits?—Is that Nature, without which theſe glorious Benefits could not have been brought forth to us, the Fleſh that profiteth nothing?—What Evil hath not contradicting this bleſſed Work led, and is like to lead our Brethren into! What befel Chriſtianity at the Beginning from its Adverſaries, hath befallen this reviving of it, at this Time. Contradicting is attended with blaſpheming, *Acts* xiii. 45.

Mr. *Erskine* adds, *We read of the Myſtery of Faith; but to conceive of Chriſt as Man, is indeed no Myſtery at all.* For Anſwer, We read of this Branch of the Myſtery of Faith. To believe that *one of the ſoldiers with a ſpear pierced his ſide, and forthwith came there out blood and water*; John xix. 34, 35. But to conceive of this is indeed no Myſtery at all.----Now, what will Mr. *Erskine* infer? Are we not to conceive of Chriſt as Man? And is

not

not the conceiving of him as Man, neceſſary to Faith, as it is a Part of the Object of Faith? tho' there be no Myſtery in conceiving of the human Nature, conſidered in itſelf.----He adds, *Yea to conceive of him as Man, and yet at the ſame Time to conceive of him, and receive him as God-Man, are flat Contradictions.*----I anſwer, To conceive of him as mere Man, excluding all other Conception of him; and to conceive of him, and receive him at the ſame Time as God-Man, would be a flat Contradiction:----But who ſaith this?---- No Man ever did, that I know of:----But to conceive of him as Man, and yet at the ſame Time to conceive of him, and receive him as God-Man, is no Contradiction; becauſe the conceiving of him as Man, is a Part of the Conception of him as God-Man, and without which we cannot receive him as God-Man, unleſs we receive what we have, and ſhould have no Conception of.----He adds, *And until Faith get itſelf ſhaken looſe of that unprofitable Mate, that imaginary Idea of him as Man, it will never believe to any Profit or Advantage, nor believe either to the ſaving of the ſoul,* Heb. x. 39. *or to the giving glory to God,* Rom. iv. 20.----Saving Faith will never get rid of this abſolutely neceſſary prerequiſite the Conception of Chriſt as Man, and without which, Faith would not be the Evidence of theſe Things which are inviſible, and not ſeen, becauſe of their Abſence and Diſtance from us. But a Conception of Chriſt as Man will remain, when Faith will be no more, for we ſhall ſee him as he is.----Let the Reader obſerve Mr. *Erskine*'s Cunning in citing two Scriptures, as if he were proving his Propoſition by them, to which they have not the leaſt Tendency:----This is to deceive the Simple. ----There follows a dreadful Perverſion of two Scriptures,----That the Doctrine of imaginary Ideas *belongs to the Philoſophy the Spirit warns againſt,* Col. ii. 8.----*And how long ſhall vain thoughts lodge*

within you? The one ſpeaks againſt vain Philoſophy,----the other againſt vain Subterfuges;----therefore they ſpeak againſt ſuch Ideas, as the Underſtanding hath of corporeal abſent Things, by the Help of the Imagination.----Have theſe Men in making a Seceſſion from the Church of *Scotland*, made alſo a Seceſſion from common Senſe?

There is nothing here but what I have touched, and I think ſhewn the Weakneſs and Sophiſtry of, except that he ſaith, *That Chriſt in forbidding* Mary *to touch him, when he appeared to her after his Reſurrection, forbids us to have any Idea or Conception of him as Man, which he ſaith is a mere mental handling of his Body* --- To propoſe this, is to expoſe it, and anſwer enough;----for it is juſt as pertinent, as it would have been to have ſaid, Chriſt forbids us to think of him as Man, becauſe he asked, *Luke* viii. 45. *Who touched me?*---From all this it is now evident, that to conceive of Chriſt as Man, or have an imaginary Idea of him as Man, if it be according to the Word, as is always underſtood, will neither lead us to a falſe Chriſt, or falſe Faith;----and that Faith in receiving the Mediator, can no more be acted without it, than without Knowledge. And that it is a very profane Prayer in Mr. *Erskine* to pray, *The Lord in Mercy to deliver us from it.*---- What he adds, *For our Senſes and Imagination will give us little Help*, appears falſe from what hath already been ſaid, and will further by what followeth.

Mr. *Fisher* in his *Review* had ſaid, Page 13. *Our Senſes and Imagination cannot aſſiſt us at all, in thinking upon the Divine Nature and Perfections.*---- Upon which I obſerve, 2*d Letter*, Page 12th,---- "Your Aſſertion is in flat Contradiction to what "the Apoſtle *Paul* ſaith, *Rom.* i. 20. For *the in-*"*viſible things of him from the creation of the* "*world are clearly ſeen, being underſtood by the* "*things that are made, even his eternal power and*

"*God-*

" *Godhead*,---(tho' there can be no Repreſentation " formed on the Imagination of the Eternity, Om- " nipreſence, Omniſcience, and Omnipotence of " God) yet our Senſes and Imagination are greatly " helpful to bring us to the Knowledge of the Di- " vine Nature and Perfections: (as the Apoſtle de- " clares, not only in the Scripture quoted, but al- " ſo *Acts* xvii. 27.)"-----Why Mr. *Erskine* leaves out the Parts encloſed in his attacking this Paſſage, he beſt knoweth,---tho' they are a conſiderable Part of my Reaſoning;---this he ſaith is unguarded Divinity:---How he makes this good, I proceed to enquire.

Let the Reader firſt obſerve, what Mr. *Erskine* grants; namely, *That the Light of Nature, and viſible Works of Creation, teacheth* quod ſit, *or that God is, and that he muſt be clothed with ſuch Perfections of Wiſdom and Power, as theſe Works declare*, Pages 53, 54.---Now, is it not by the Intervention of our Senſes and Imagination, that we know theſe viſible Things, and receive this Article, that they teach us, according to Mr. *Erskine*'s Conceſſion, *the Being of God, and that he is clothed with Wiſdom and Power?*---And conſequently, Are not our Senſes and Imagination greatly helpful to bring us to the Knowledge of the Being of God, and of his Nature, as he is wiſe and powerful, according to what the Apoſtle aſſerts, and other Scriptures? And is not Mr. *Fiſher*'s Aſſertion, according to Mr. *Erskine*'s own Conceſſion, *That our Senſes and Imagination cannot aſſiſt us at all in thinking upon the Divine Nature and Perfections*, in flat Contradiction to what the Apoſtle and other Scriptures aſſert?---2*dly*, Are not the Being, the eternal Power and Wiſdom of God, the inviſible Things of God, that are the Objects of Faith, and not of Senſe?---Now, is not Mr. *Erskine* aſſerting, that the viſible Works of Creation manifeſt theſe inviſible Things of God, which can only be by the Intervention of our

our Senſes and Imaginations, in flat Contradiction to what the ſame Apoſtle ſaith, 2 *Cor.* ii. 11, 12, 13. *The things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God. Now we have not received the ſpirit of this world, but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given us of God; which things we ſpeak, not in the words which man's wiſdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghoſt teacheth, comparing ſpiritual things with ſpiritual*; not natural and ſenſible Things with ſpiritual, by our own Imagination, but ſpiritual Things with ſpiritual, by a Faith of God's Operation.---- Let Mr. *Erskine* anſwer himſelf, and looſe himſelf out of his own fancied Contradiction, wherein he is as much engaged, as he imagines I am.

2*dly*, Let the Reader obſerve, what Mr. *Erskine* alledges upon me, *That theſe viſible Things that ſtrike our Senſes and Imaginations, can lead us to the right and ſaving Knowledge of God, his Nature and Perfections*;----*and that our Senſes and Imagination can bring us to the ſufficient and ſaving Knowledge of God, without the Bible and the Teachings of the Spirit of God*, Page 54.----Theſe Things I never thought, aſſerted or inſinuate,----let the Reader judge of this diſhoneſt Dealing.----Theſe Propoſitions Mr. *Erskine* diſputes againſt;----long may he diſpute againſt them, and well may he be employed;---- and therefore I leave his Reaſoning, be it good or bad as it ſtands, ſeeing the Thing I have ſaid is not concerned with it;----only I ſhall ſhew Mr. *Erskine* what I aſſert upon this Head.

1*ſt*, I aſſert that our Senſes and Imagination are greatly helpful to bring us to the Knowledge of the Being of God, and his Wiſdom and Power.

2*dly*, I aſſert, that our Senſes and Imagination are helpful to bring us to the Knowledge of many other of the Divine Perfections, ſeeing the Works of Creation and Providence diſcover them in ſome Meaſure to us;----ſuch as his Eternity, Goodneſs,

Immuta-

Immutability, Omniſcience, *&c.*---all this the Light of Nature teacheth, and the Scriptures clearly declare.

3dly, I aſſert, that altho' we cannot have the ſaving Knowledge of God, without the inward and effectual Teachings of the Holy Spirit, yet without the Help of our Senſes and Imagination in an ordinary Way, we cannot have that ſaving Knowledge of the Divine Nature and Perfections, which is the Effect of the Spirit's Teaching. The Reaſon is evident, becauſe all the Knowledge of God, his Nature and Perfections, we have by the outward Means of his Works and Word, which the Holy Spirit makes effectual, is attained by the Intervention of our Senſes and Imagination. The Works of God and the Sacraments, manifeſt him to us by the Eye, as doth alſo the Word read by us, and the Word preached, or otherwiſe taught by the Ear.---M. *Erskine* now hath what I aſſert at large, he may try his Hand with them when he pleaſeth;---only before I leave this Subject, according to the moſt feaſible Way of Dealing with my Sort of Adverſaries, I ſhall ſhew my Divinity is that of other ſound Divines, as theirs is not.

Burges upon *Original Sin*, Page 351. "The imaginative Power or Phantaſy in a Man, is immediately ſubſervient to the Underſtanding in its Operations." Page 353. "The imaginative Faculty is ſo near to the Intellectual, that in all its Operations, it (*viz.* the Underſtanding) hath ſome Dependence upon it."

Manton, Vol. III. Page 32. "God hath given us a Body, bored through with five Senſes to let out Thoughts, and to take in Objects; to taſte the Goodneſs of God in the Creatures, and ſee Divinity in them, and hear the Voice by which they proclaim the Glory of God. Page 53. Meditation upon the Creatures is a Work that is of great Profit; partly to heighten Fancy, and make it fit for

" Meditation. O practiſe upon the Creation, and " you will find Fancy to be much elevated and rai- " ſed."— Page 256. " Mans Reaſon is lower than " that of the Angels, becauſe it needs the Miniſtry " of *Fancy* and *Imagination*, Fancy needs *outward* " *Senſe*, which an Angel needeth nor."

See alſo the former Paſſages from *Charnock*, to which many more might be added. — From all this, it is now evident, that our Senſes and Imagination are not only helpful, to us to think upon the Nature and Perfections of God, but, while we are in the Body, abſolutely neceſſary to our attaining to the Knowledge of God;-- and that Mr. *Fiſher* and Mr. *Erskine*'s contrary Aſſertion, is alſo contrary both to Scripture and Reaſon.

What Mr. *Erskine* hath about the Abuſe of Nature's Light, I have nothing to do with it. It ſuppoſeth, that there was much Knowledge of the inviſible Things of God to be attained by the viſible Things of the Creation, manifeſting theſe inviſible Things to us, by the Intervention of our Senſes and Imagination, elſe it could not be abuſed. And this Abuſe ſprung not only from the Corruption of the Imagination, but of all the Powers and Faculties of the Soul;--- and yet the Imagination, conſidered as a natural Faculty and Power, is as abſolutely neceſſary to our attaining to Knowledge, as the other natural Faculties;--- howſoever much the Corruption of the Imagination, and other Faculties may hinder the attaining it, or abuſe it when attained.---For the Queſtion here is not, whether the Imagination, and other Faculties, as corrupted and unſanctified, hindred from attaining all that Knowledge of God taught by the viſible Things of Creation, and abuſed what was attained, which is not controverted; but whether we are greatly helped by theſe Powers, as natural Powers and Faculties, to attain unto the Knowledge of God, and ſuch as without them we cannot. The contrary to this, is what Mr. *Erskine* ſhould have proven,

ſeeing

ſeeing he ſo confidently aſſerts, That our Senſes and Imagination, (that is, theſe natural Powers and Faculties, for it is of them, under this Conſideration, all alongſt in this Controverſy they are ſpoken of) inſtead of being greatly helpful to us, do greatly hinder us to think upon the Nature and Perfections of God.---- But this is what he hath not done, and ſhall never be able to do, unleſs he can prove, that the natural eſſential Powers God hath given to us as Men, are not helpful to us; but we would know God much better if we wanted them:--That is to ſay, a Man would attain the Knowledge of God's Nature and Perfections, by the viſible Things of the Creation, much better, he were blind, deaf, without feeling, and the other Senſes, and without the Faculty of the Imagination.—This is the total Amount of that impertinent Jumble of Scriptures Mr. *Erskine* hath, Page 55. 56, 57.----I am afraid he won't get many, even Seceders, that will chuſe to put his Concluſion to the Trial.

He ſaith, Page 57, That he was led to encroach upon the Province of a fitter and better Hand (they are really both ſo dextrous, in a ſeceding Way, of arguing, that it will be hard to tell, which of the two is the fitteſt and beſt Hand) *by Mr.* Robe's *citing Mr.* Shepherd *and him, upon the Subject of imaginary Ideas.*----This the Reader will find, Page 47, where Mr. *Erskine* ſaith, *I cite him and Mr.* Shepherd *upon the Subject of imaginary Ideas, or the Images of ſpiritual Things repreſented to the Fancy. Firſt*, I never underſtood imaginary Ideas to be the Images of ſpiritual Things repreſented to the Fancy, and therefore, never cited Mr. *Erskine* or Mr. *Shepherd* upon this Subject. *2dly*, I never cited Mr. *Erskine* or Mr. *Shepherd*'s Mind, either for or againſt imaginary Ideas, as all ſenſible Mankind underſtands them.---- I did indeed quote Mr. *Shepherd's Sound Believer*, and Mr. *Ralph Erskine*'s Sermon, *The giving Love of Chriſt*, 2d *Letter*, Page 17. to prove their Words,

Words, were as capable of the groſs Meaning Mr. *Fiſher* had put upon Mr. *Edwards* Sermon, as the Words of Mr. *Edwards* Sermon.----To this Mr. *Erskine* makes not the leaſt Anſwer;—but inſtead of ſhewing their Words were not as capable of that Meaning as Mr. *Edwards* Words, which is what he ſhould have done, he doth not ſo much as touch this, not ſo much as quote the Page of my *Letter* where theſe Quotations are, leſt the Reader ſhould have, by looking into it, found out his Trick.—As to the Paſſage he cites from Mr. *Shepherd*'s *Parable*, &c.—I am of Mr. *Shepherd*'s Opinion,—and of Mr. *Fraſer*'s, who hath this at greater Length.

And do aſſure Mr. *Erskine* the Doctrine of it was faithfully preached, and, by the Lord's Bleſſing upon it, (namely Chriſt, as he is held forth in the Goſpel) the Converſions were made.

What I next obſerve in Mr. *Erskine*'s Performance is, malicious murthering in an indirect coloured Manner.—He would ſlily inſinuate, that I, or the Reverend Dr. *Cooper*, were of a deiſtical Spirit; Page 45. he ſaith, *The preſent Work, ſo much magnified, I cannot but fear is alſo promoted by ſome that ſeem to be Favourers of a deiſtical Spirit.*—And then he immediately adds, *I ſee Mr.* Robe, *in his ſecond Letter to Mr.* Fiſher, *citing with Approbation the Words of the Prefacer to Mr.* Edwards's *Sermon, and therein I ſee very great ſeeming Regard paid to the Scripture, as the* GREAT *and* STANDING, *an* INFALLIBLE *and* SUFFICIENT RULE. —Firſt Mr. *Erskine* is miſtaken; for I do not cite theſe as the Words of Dr. *Cooper*, but of Mr. *Edwards*, Page 15. whoſe they are.—It were to be wiſhed thir Brethren would allow themſelves but common Thought and Deliberation, before they write to the Publick;—ſo the learned and worthy Doctor hath eſcaped for once;—yet Mr. *Edwards* and I are left in the Lurch.—Now, what is it that Mr. *Edwards* hath ſaid that ſavours of a deiſtical Spirit,

Spirit, and that I approve of? Why, he ſaith, *The holy Scripture is the great and ſtanding Rule, which God hath given to his Church, to guide them in all Things relating to the great Concern of their Souls; and it is an infallible and ſufficient Rule.*—Did ever any Deiſt, or Perſon favouring of a deiſtical Spirit ſay this?—Is not the Doctrine here aſſerted ever-ſive of Deiſm, and in flat Contradiction to it?—I here call publickly upon Mr. *Erskine* to prove, that theſe Propoſitions favour of a deiſtical Spirit, or be reputed further a Slanderer and falſe Accuſer of the Brethren.

But yet ſaith Mr. *Erskine*, he doth not call it the only Rule: For adds he, *It would ſeem any notable Epithet may be given it, providing it be not called the only Rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy God. This good old Way of ſpeaking, with reſpect to the antient Proteſtant Doctrine of the Perfection of the Scripture, as the only Rule of Faith and Practice, ſeems to be going out of Faſhion. I confeſs I am not perfectly pleaſed with their Teſtimony to the preſent extraordinary Work, as a Work of the Spirit of God, whoſe Principles tend any Way to the Diſparagement of the Word of God.*—Now Reader, doth not this poor malicious Stuff deſerve to be expoſed? *Firſt* then, this proves Mr. *Erskine* himſelf to favour of a deiſtical Spirit, to turn his Words upon himſelf. Mr. *Erskine* doth not ſay, in the good old Way of ſpeaking, the Scripture is the only Rule to direct us how we may glorify and enjoy God *for ever*; he leaves out that Word of our ſhorter Catechiſm *for ever*.—Now let us argue as he doth. It would ſeem any notable Epithet may be given it, providing it be not ſaid to be the only Rule to direct us how to glorify and enjoy God *for ever*. This good old Way of ſpeaking, with reſpect to the antient Chriſtian Doctrine of a future State, and the everlaſting Enjoyment of God therein, and the Uſefulneſs of the Scripture to direct to this, whatever

Uſe it may have for this Life, ſeems to be going out of Faſhion. I confeſs I am not perfectly pleaſed with their publick Teſtimony for the Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline, and Government of the Houſe of God, whoſe Principles tend any Way to diſparage the Doctrine of the Word about a future State, and the everlaſting Enjoyment of God.—I refer it to the Reader, if the arguing be not as good and ſtronger againſt himſelf, as againſt us.—Tho' this is ſufficient to expoſe the Weakneſs and Malice of Mr. *Erskine*'s Reaſoning here,—yet, 2*dly*, Doth not Mr. *Edwards* aſſerting, that the Word is the great and ſtanding Rule which God hath given to his Church, to guide them in all Things relating to the great Concerns of their Souls, and that it is an infallible and ſufficient Rule, aſſert it to be the only Rule that God hath given? And that no other is needed, ſeeing it is *infallible*, *ſufficient* and *ſtanding*.—3*dly*, Mr. *Erskine* may as ſolidly argue againſt our Confeſſion of Faith, and me for approving it, as ſavouring of a deiſtical Spirit, becauſe it doth not uſe the Word *only*. Confeſſion, Cap. I. Page 2. *All which are given by Inſpiration of God, to be the Rule of Faith and Life.* Did the Compilers of the Confeſſion of Faith, and the Signers and Approvers of it ſince, ſavour of a deiſtical Spirit? Had they Principles tending to the Diſparagement of the Word of God, becauſe they uſed not the Word *only* here?—And is there any Reaſon to argue upon this Account againſt Mr. *Edwards*, who gives more notable Epithets to the Scripture as a Rule, than the *Confeſſion* doth in that Paragraph.—*Laſtly*, I quoted this Paſſage from Mr. *Edwards*'s Sermon, in the laſt Page of my ſecond Letter, and which you ſhould have pointed your Reader to, that I might ſhew Mr. *Edwards*'s Sermon had no Tendency to promote *Enthuſiaſm*, and eſtabliſh it, as Mr. *Fiſher* charged it, ſeeing it refers in ſo ſtrong Terms, every Thing relating to the great Concerns of our Souls, to the

Word

Word of God, as the great, ſtanding, infallible, and ſufficient Rule given us of God, to guide us therein.—This was the Argument you ſhould have anſwered, if you could.—But in this you are as ſilent as a Fiſh.

As to Mr. *Erskine*'s other Flings at this bleſſed Work, I ſhall reſerve the Notice of them to the Poſtſcript of this Letter, and now return, Mr. *Fiſher*, to your *Preface*.

Page 13. you conclude your reaſoning againſt the Error your fertile Imagination had formed, with this judicious Reflection, *And becauſe many at this Day have not received the Truth in the Love of it, but inſtead thereof, antiſcriptural Impreſſions upon their Imagination; therefore hath God alſo ſent them ſtrong Deluſions to believe a Lie.*—The whole of this is profane and antiſcriptural.—It is a bold and ſhameleſs Calumny, that the many you ſpeak of have received antiſcriptural Impreſſions: How come you to know that they have? Did they tell it you themſelves? Of above Five hundred I have converſed with, I am perſuaded five of them never ſpake to you.—Have any other that converſed with theſe ſame Perſons, whom I am not able to prove in this to be a falſe Witneſs, told it you?—Your Conſcience can well tell you who is the Forger.—But ſuppoſe they have received antiſcriptural Impreſſions upon their Imagination, this would be rather their Diſeaſe and Puniſhment than their Sin, ſeeing it is no more what they can help, than Impreſſions upon the Imagination in a Fever or Frenzy; and ſo in this View it is both nonſenſical, and daring Preſumption, in aſſigning an involuntary Diſeaſe, as the procuring Cauſe of one of the moſt dreadful Judgments of God, and in daring to interpret the Providence of God ſo maliciouſly, and make it ſpeak the Language of your own Fancy.—But that which is worſt of all, is your dreadful Lie of Providence, aſſerting, that the God who is greatly to be feared, hath ſent

the

the many good People we ſpeak of, *ſtrong Deluſions to believe a Lie*, when it is not in your Power, never ſhall be in your Power, to prove, that they believe a Lie, and when Men of the moſt undoubted Credit, Veracity and Judgment, from their own perſonal Knowledge, teſtify the contrary.—And then when you have forged the Story of the righteous Lord's having inflicted one of his moſt dreadful Judgments, you poſitively and boldly aſſign the Cauſes, as if you had heard the Secrets of God, and turned over the Records of Heaven.—Your Guilt and Danger both are great.—I really pity you; and, whatever you think of me, pray much for Repentance to you.

You proceed and ſay, it *is manifeſt that there is a twofold Lie believed, in Conſequence of this ſtrong Deluſion, whereof Mr.* Whitefield *was the chief human Inſtrument under the Father of Lies.* As to Mr. *Whitefield*'s Inſtrumentality, it ſhall be ſet in a due Light afterwards, if the Lord ſpare and permit;—but what do I ſee, Brother? The Father of Lies, a frightful Term relative to the Devil, in your Writings, the *Shiboleth* of your Party:—But poſſibly you think, you may warrantably write and ſpeak as much of the Devil as you will, providing you do not fright People with ſuch Terms in preaching.—Well, you ſay 'tis *manifeſt that theſe People believe two Lies*:—But what think you of many, who, in believing your *Review*, believe above a Score? as both the Reverend Mr. *Webſter* and I have made manifeſt to the World; and who, in believing ſeveral Sermons preached by your Brethren, muſt believe no fewer; under whoſe Influence is this? I ſhall uſe no frightful Terms, but leave it to yourſelf to determine.—And here I aſſert nothing but what I ſhall prove, if called to it.

The firſt Lie you ſay, Page 14. they believe is concerning Conviction: To inſtruct this, you *firſt* deſcribe the Work of Conviction the Holy Spirit is

the

the Author of. 2*dly*, You aſſert in Fact, what the Convictions of the People in Debate are, and that they are unlike to Convictions by the Spirit.

As to the *firſt*, The Account you give of the Spirit's convincing Work, is far from exact and true.—Your Words are, *But when the Spirit of God convinces of Sin, it is always by the Means of the Word, for* by the law is the knowledge of Sin, *the Spirit convinces of Sin as offenſive to God, he convinces of all Sin, and does it in a ſolid and rational Way.*—There are ſeveral very groſs Miſtakes here,—as *firſt*, That the Spirit when he convinces of Sin, doth it always by the Word or written Law.—In his convincing Work upon the Heathen, the Inſtrument he made uſe of, was the Remains of the Law written upon their Heart, *Rom.* ii. 14, 15.—For to uſe the Words of Mr. *Charnock*, "All Motions of Conſcience, all "Convictions, whether upon thoſe that reject them, "or thoſe that receive them, are either mediately "or immediately from the Spirit of God;"—and ſo theſe in the Heathen, who had no written Word, were from him.—It is as groſs a Miſtake, that the Spirit convinceth all whom he convinceth of Sin, as it is offenſive to God;—for though 'tis true, that where Conviction iſſues in a ſaving Work of Converſion, the Holy Spirit ſooner or later convinceth of Sin as offenſive to God; yet many are under a real Work of Conviction, who are never convinced of Sin as it is offenſive to God, as in all thoſe, where a Work of Conviction never goes further than a common Work, as *Cain*, *Ahab* and *Judas*,—and even in the Elect, while the Holy Spirit acts only as a Spirit of Bondage,—Your third Miſtake is, That the Spirit, always when he convinces of Sin, doth it of all Sin. Where it never goes further than a common Work, the Sinner is never convinced of all Sin.—And Mr. *Shepherd*, and all who treat judiciouſly upon this Subject, aſſert, That even in thoſe, where it proves a ſaving Work, the Holy Spirit begins uſually

to

to convince of ſome one Sin, and proceeds gradually with many, until he convince them of all Sin, which may be a conſiderable Time;—ſo that all that Time, tho' the Spirit really is convincing of Sin, yet he hath not convinced them of all Sin.—Theſe are conſiderable Miſtakes in Divinity.—Having then rectified them, I proceed,

2*dly*, To Matter of Fact, wherein you aſſert, That our Peoples Convictions were not ſuch, and yet they believed they were under a Work of Conviction, which was believing a Lie.—*But the preſent deluſive Convictions, ariſe from ſtrong Impreſſions upon the Imagination, which cannot miſs to be very confuſed and diſorderly, they are only partial, reaching only to ſome particular Sins, and do not breed a Diſlike unto all Sin as offenſive to God.*—Here is as barefaced and ſhameleſs a Forgery of Falſhood in Matters of Fact, and Aſſertion of it, as the Reader poſſibly hath heard or ſeen.—That their Convictions might be partial, and may not breed a Diſlike to all Sin as offenſive to God, and yet be a real Work of Conviction, hath already been declared;—but that the Convictions of theſe which appeared to iſſue well, were only partial, and did not breed a Diſlike to all Sin as offenſive to God, and that they aroſe from ſtrong Impreſſions upon the Imagination, is what I, and many of Judgment and Credit, have witneſſed the contrary.—And there are many here, and elſewhere, beſides the Convicts themſelves, who have heard them declare, that their great Diſtreſs began with a Conviction of Sin, and for the moſt Part, of Unbelief; that with many of them, their Convictions came to be very particular; and they were affected with their Sins as offenſive to God.—Now, Sir, How can you, how dare you allow yourſelf, to aſſert ſo confidently Facts, that neither you, nor any of your Informers, can know by yourſelves? And contrary to the Declaration of thoſe, who have certain poſitive Knowledge of all this?—Are you not afraid of the

the Wrath of the God of Truth, and to whom all Lying is an Abomination?—We do declare, and are ready to do it in the moſt ſolemn Manner, that if we know our Bibles, if we know the Chriſtian Religion, as it hath been taught us by our worthy Anceſtors, theſe People we debate anent, were under a real Work of Conviction, if ever there were any ſuch from the Beginning of the World;—and that they believed no Lie, in believing it.—Now, Sir, conſider what you, and your People, who endeavour ſo zealouſly to perſuade, that it is no Work of Conviction that is dealing with theſe People, contrary to our moſt particular Declaration of Facts, and which you muſt own is a real Work of Conviction, if Facts be true; I ſay, what do you, or can you propoſe to yourſelves by this?—Doth it not tend to prejudice your Followers, and all others againſt all Conviction of Sin, and every uneaſy Senſe of it; ſeeing they can never feel upon themſelves, or ſee in others any other real Conviction as to the Kind of it, howſoever much it may differ in Meaſure and Degree, from the Convictions of our People? Doth it not tend to harden ſecure Sinners, or formal Hypocrites, in the good Opinion they have of their State, tho' they were never convinced of Sin in the leaſt, and to make them Proof againſt all Impreſſions?—Doth it not tend to hinder a Work of Conviction going on to Converſion, or at leaſt ſome Reformation of Life, which is a great Mercy in thoſe who are under it, and liſten to you, or ſuch as you?—All theſe direful and doleful Effects it hath had here;—and therefore, I leave the Blood of all theſe Souls, whoſe Convictions either have been prevented, or murdered by you, or theſe miſerably deceived Followers of yours, in this Congregation or Neighbourhood, upon you and them;—and if you and they repent not, God will require it at your Hand and theirs.—The Caſe between you and us now, is not barely your Seceſſion;—but we endeavouring to perſuade Sinners

to repent of Sin, and believe upon the Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and you uſing all your Influence to prevail with them not to be perſuaded by us.—We doing what we can to convince and convert Sinners, and in a fair Way of doing it, by the Grace and Influences of the Holy Ghoſt, and you doing furiouſly all you can to hinder it, as if you had rather a thouſand Times they ſhould go to Hell, as not follow you in your Schiſm.—The Lord judge between you and us in this Particular.

As to the ſecond Particular, you ſay, they believe a Lie as to their Converſion.—In Anſwer to this, it is ſufficient, that I here teſtify and declare, That of all the Perſons known to me, and of whom I had charitable Hopes that they are converted, I knew none who took ſudden and tranſient Flaſhes of Joy, ariſing from the Repreſentation of pleaſing Objects upon the Imagination, for true Converſion,—and that they have lived ſince in much Meekneſs, Love, and Chriſtian Forbearance, pitying and praying for ſuch as you, their declared Enemies;—ſo that here is a ſecond Lie upon your Part, and not upon theirs.

You add, Page 14. *They have a rooted Prejudice againſt any Teſtimony for the declarative Glory of God, or for the Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government which the Lord Jeſus has inſtituted in his Houſe, in Oppoſition to all Corruptions and Defections therefrom.*—Well, what if they have an Averſion, and a rooted Prejudice againſt your *Act and Teſtimony?*—This won't ſay, that they are not converted.—According to your own Conceſſion, *Review*, Page 24.—and Mr. *Ralph Erskine*, in his *True Chriſt, no new Chriſt*, Page 31. *A vile Reproach is indeed caſt upon us*, ſaith he, *as if we would allow none to be true Converts, but thoſe that follow us; nor nothing to be the Work of God, but what is wrought among us; nor none to be true Chriſtians, but ſuch as join in with* (what they call) *our* Teſtimony.—You may reconcile thir Conceſſions, with your bringing it in here,

here, as an Evidence that they believe a Lie, when they believe they are converted, at your Leiſure.—They are ſatisfied with that regular orderly Teſtimony their Miniſters give in a State of Church-Communion, to the Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government in his Houſe, *&c.* by their ſolemn Oath and Subſcription when they were ordained Miniſters, and to which they profeſs to adhere unto this Day.—They can ſee no Difference between you and the Church of *Scotland*, as to Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government,—except now that Hereſy Mr. *Ralph Erſkine* and you have advanced about the human Nature of the glorious Mediator, and particularly by Mr. *Erskine* in Terms, THAT IT IS NO PART OF THE OBJECT OF FAITH,—AND THAT IT PROFITETH NOTHING; which yet they will not charge upon the Aſſociate Presbytery, unleſs they do really, what they falſly accuſe the Church of *Scotland* of, tollerate and not cenſure the Erroneous, by their not calling Mr. *Ralph Erskine* to account, for his Hereſy and Blaſphemy above-mentioned.—Theſe dear People look upon your Teſtimony as *proteſtatio contra factum*; for they ſee that you have rebelled, and proven ſtubborn to the Diſcipline and Government Chriſt hath inſtituted in his Church, to the bringing the dreadful Guilt of Perjury upon your own Souls; and that you have done more to overturn the Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government Chriſt hath inſtituted in his Houſe, than all the Enemies have been ſince our happy Revolution.—They obſerve, theſe who have been moſt zealous for your Teſtimony, are far from being better Chriſtians ſince they became ſuch; yea, that they grow only in Wrath, Spite, Envy, Evil-ſpeaking and Lying, and much Self-Conceit.—They know the moſt of your zealous Fellowers, who have, without finding any Bones in it, approven it, have never read it; or, if they have, cannot underſtand it.—They have ſeen them put it in the Place of their

Bibles, and good Books they were formerly converſant with.—Some of them ſee, that it contains ſeveral groſs Lies, as the Reverend Mr. *Currie* hath proven.---And finally, as to the Way of witneſſing you require of ſuch as them, by withdrawing from the Lord's Ordinances, to which they formerly reſorted, and in the Uſe of which they profited, and by engaging never more to hear Miniſters of the Church of *Scotland*; they can ſee no more needful to qualify People, for giving this Approbation of your *Teſtimony*, but Lazineſs, groſs Profanity, and Contempt of Ordinances.—They cannot think the Lord calls them to that, which any profane Man, as he is profane, and becauſe he is profane, can do;—and it is what they ſee ſeveral profane Perſons, filled with a Spirit of Spite and Revenge againſt their Miniſters do.—Theſe are ſome of the Grounds of their rooted Prejudice againſt your ſchiſmatical and irregular *Teſtimony*.—I leave it to others to judge the Relevancy of them.

You conclude thus,---*And no Wonder, for their Leaders cauſe them to err, and to look upon theſe as their worſt Enemies who tell them the Truth.*—I can aſſure you, if they look upon you, and others of your Sort as their worſt Enemies, they pity you and pray for you, and their Leaders encourage them to it by Advice and Example.—They have no Reaſon to look upon you as their worſt Enemies for telling them the Truth; for they ſeldom hear ſeverals of you, but they are ſenſible you tell them Things which they know, and can prove to be falſe.

You begin the next Paragraph with a Mixture of Truth and Falſhood, which muſt be ſeparate,---Page 14. 15. *I find that the Promoters of this Work have been making very diligent Search into the Writings of great Men, to get their Authority in Support of bodily Diſtreſſes, and viſionary Repreſentations, which, they alledge, are not inconſiſtent with a Work of the true Spirit, but in many Inſtances attend it, and naturally*

turally flow from it.—As to the bodily Diſtreſſes all is granted.—As to viſionary Repreſentations, we had no Inſtances of them.—If there were a very few Inſtances here, who once in the Time of their Trouble miſtook a ſtrong and diſordered Exerciſe of their Imagination, ſo as to think they ſaw what they only imagined, this was owing to their Ignorance and Incapacity, that they put their Conceptions in wrong and improper Words;—and I do maintain, that ſuch a vapouriſh Fit was not inconſiſtent with a Work of the true Spirit.---Witneſs the Caſe of *Eliſabeth Cairns*. You may ſee ſeveral Inſtances of this in the *Appendix* to the fifth Article of my *Narrative*.—That in many Inſtances, ſuch viſionary Repreſentations either in the proper Uſe of your Words, or in the Senſe I have put upon them, attended and naturally flowed from a Work of the true Spirit, I never thought, much leſs alledged it;—and ſo your Alledgance is falſe as to me.---As to any others alledging this, I know nothing of it;—if you can vouch what you ſay, let them anſwer for themſelves.

As to the Challenge you in the next Words give to *the Supporters of this Work, to adduce any approven Author in Contradiction to the true State of the Queſtion, as you have handled it, namely, that the true Work of the Spirit of God, in Conviction and Converſion, is not attended with the gloomy Appearances of bodily Agonies, and viſionary Repreſentations, which cleave unto this Work, at the very Time in which it is alledged they are convicted or converted.*—I anſwer, This is the firſt Time that ever I heard of your keeping to any State of a Queſtion.—2*dly*, The State of the Queſtion you here give is far from being the true State of the Queſtion.—It is alſo put in moſt ambiguous, and deceitful Terms.—And you may ſafely challenge all the Supporters of this Work, to give any approven Author, in Contradiction to ſuch a State of the Queſtion as you have mentioned.—None of them will eſſay to do it.—

it.—They know better Things than receive Rules from an avowed Adverſary, how to maintain the Cauſe of Truth.—The Reader may obſerve the following Things falſe, deceitful, and ambiguous in the State of the Queſtion, as you pretend to give it.—Firſt you aſſert, that *the true Work of the Spirit of God is not attended with the gloomy Appearances of bodily Agonies.*—If you underſtand, in Contradiction to this, That the true Work of the Spirit of God is attended, that is *always*, with the gloomy Appearances of bodily Agonies, you have none of the Supporters of this Work aſſerting this.—It hath been declared often, that the greateſt Part of the Subjects of a true Work of the Spirit of God here, and elſewhere, were not under the gloomy Appearances of bodily Agonies,—particularly upon the 17th of this current *April*, a Woman above fifty, and a Man above thirty, were both very ſharply awakened while hearing the Word here, without any bodily Agonies.—But if the Propoſition in Contradiction to yours be, That the true Work of the Spirit of God is *ſometimes*, tho' not *always*, attended with the gloomy Appearances of bodily Agonies; and that theſe bodily Agonies are not inconſiſtent and incompatible with it.—This is what we have aſſerted, and alſo proven,—and have given the approven Author of *the fulfilling of the Scriptures*, and Mr. *Ralph Erskine* in his Letter to Mr. *Weſley*, a Prieſt of the Church of *England*, aſſerting the ſame in Contradiction to you.—See alſo the *Appendix* to the fifth Article of my *Narrative*.—2*dly*, As to the viſionary Repreſentations cleaving to this Work, which you caſt into the State of the Queſtion, we diſown them; but ſay if they were, they are warranted, as not inconſiſtent with a Work of the Spirit, tho' no Part of it, by the Inſtance of your own *Eliſabeth Cairns*. 3*dly*, You add, that theſe gloomy Appearances do not attend this true Work of the Spirit AT THE VERY TIME, *in which it is alledged*

alledged they are convicted or converted.—We aſſert they do attend it at the very Time they are convicted,—and have proven it too,—and you ſhall never be able to prove the contrary—as to their attending this Work, at the very Time they are alledged to be converted.—We never pretended to determine the Time when any are converted, we do not think it knowable, and therefore never alledged any ſuch Time:—But this we aſſert, That you, or any Man elſe, ſhall never be able to prove, that they are inconſiſtent with the Spirit's Work at the very Time he converts the Sinner;—and this is enough, and ſufficient to vindicate this bleſſed Work from your Aſpertions.—They who pleaſe to ſee the Queſtion fairly ſtated, and expreſly what both you and we aſſert, he may find it in the Beginning of my third Letter to you.

Next Paragraph, Page 15. you advertiſe the Reader, that *any of the Saints in this Kingdom, to whom uncommon Experiences are aſcribed, have been ſuch as were giving Teſtimony againſt the Defections of their Times, which cannot ſo much as be pretended to be the Caſe, either of the Promoters or Approvers of this Work.*—Was there ever an Advertiſement more impertinent and falſe? I would have the Reader carefully to notice, *Firſt*, That the Queſtion is not about the Experiences of the Promoters and Approvers of this Work, but the Subjects of it, and ſo you have forſaken the true State of the Queſtion you pretend to give, in the very Words next to it. *2dly*, Theſe Saints in this Kingdom bare Teſtimony againſt the Defections of their Times, (which were unſpeakably greater than any you have, even calumniouſly, charged upon this Church) in a Way of Church-communion, and without ſeparating from the Church, tho' under Biſhops, and theſe of the worſt Sort. This Practice of theirs condemns, and is a ſtanding Teſtimony againſt your Schiſm.—This peaceable and Chriſt-like Practice of theirs is imitated

ted by the Promoters and Approvers of this Work, who not only pretend, but really and openly, in a Way of Church-communion, give Teſtimony againſt the Defections of their Times.

You proceed to ſhew, that the Inſtance I had given of Mr. *Robert Scot* Miniſter at *Glaſgow*, is nothing to my Purpoſe, Page 15.—Now, Sir, pardon my pointing out to the Reader another of your little Tricks.—You ſeldom quote the Letter, or Page of it you pretend to anſwer, that ſo the Reader, being unable to find it, may not be able to ſee the Inſufficiency of your Anſwer, by comparing what both you and I ſay.----Here is one Inſtance beſides ſeveral others, both in your Preface, and Mr. *Ralph Erskine's Appendix*.---The Reader then will find Mr. *Scot's* Viſion, and the Uſe I make of it, Letter 2d, Page 13.---You'll eaſily remember, Sir, that in your *Review*, Page 13. *That the viſionary Repreſentation of inviſible Objects in the Imagination, is the fertile Source of all ſatanical Impoſture*, was confidently aſſerted by you.—In my ſecond Letter, foreſaid Page, in Oppoſition to this extravagant, unlimited Propoſion of yours,—I ſaid, "Now, Sir, hath not this "been where it was not the Source of any ſatani- "cal Impoſture," as in the Inſtance of the Protomartyr *Stephen*, Acts vii. and other Inſtances already given?----Will you ſay, it was the Source of ſatanical Impoſture in theſe worthy Saints, and reforming Miniſters mentioned by Mr. *Fleming* and others, of which I could give you Plenty of Inſtances? I give only the Inſtance of Mr. *Robert Scot*.---The Point you ſhould have touched, and the Queſtion you ſhould have anſwered, is, Whether theſe Viſions were the Source of ſatanical Impoſture in theſe Saints or not.---And if they were not, as you dare not ſay they were, then you ſhould have honeſtly revoked what you had aſſerted, and acknowledged your Propoſition was falſe:---But, inſtead of this, you firſt quote the Viſion, as I had done, and then add, *But Mr.*

Robe

Robe *induſtriouſly omits what was ſaid immediately before, as what would by no Means quadrate or agree with the Work he is ſupporting, namely*, "On "his Death-bed he did witneſs his Soul's Abhor- "rence at the wicked and ſinful Courſes of the "Time, and my Comfort is, ſaith he, that God "with-held me from them. If I were to live, I "ſhould not be ſo ſparing as I have been to wit- "neſs againſt theſe."---Is there the leaſt Anſwer to what I adduced this Viſion for? Inſtead of this, you fall a quarrelling me for not quoting what he had ſaid, at another Time to Mr. *Livingſton*, and others, about the Corruptions of the Times, and which hath no Connection with the Viſion, and doth not alter the Queſtion we have about the Viſion, if he had never uttered theſe Words.---Let the Reader judge if the adducing them would either have weakened or ſtrengthned my Argument,------and your adducing them is to as little Purpoſe;----for it doth not in the leaſt touch the Point controverted between you and me.-----And as to this preſent bleſſed Work, there is nothing in them in the leaſt againſt it.------You conclude with your uſual Modeſty, that you may afterwards ſhew, that all the Paſſages we have quoted, are as little to our Purpoſe, as this Viſion of Mr. *Scot*.----Now, Sir, have you ſhewed that this Paſſage is not to our Purpoſe, what are the Words you have uſed to ſhew it, and by what Argument, let the Reader ſee if he can find them; and admire your ſtrange Confidence.----Well, the threatned Performance, if like this laſt, doth not much alarm.

Page 17. You have a Poſtſcript of a Piece with your *Preface* and *Review*, wherein you quarrel the obſerving the 18th of *February*, as a Day of Thankſgiving, for the firſt diſcernable outpouring of the Holy Spirit at *Cambuſlang*, upon that Day the preceeding Year, and Prayer, that it may be increaſed, and prove general through the Land.---Here you vent a great

great many black Calumnies, without the leaſt Ground or Fear.---As *firſt, That the whole Tendency of this Work, is to worm out any Zeal from the Minds of People, anent any particular Form of Church-Government, that by a total Indifferency,* &c. *that ſo our Presbyterians in* Scotland *may be led by Degrees, into a Coaleſcence with the Church of* England *and* Rome, *&c.*---The Accuſer of the Brethren, ſpeaking immediately, could not more confidently have uttered a notour Falſhood.----All ſober People, in their right Senſes, will look upon it as ſuch, until you bring Proof for it, which you ſhall never be able to do.

Your Arguments againſt the Obſervation of that Day, are, *firſt*, That by the ſame Rule, the Obſervation of all the Anniverſaries in the *Engliſh* and Popiſh *Calendars* may be introduced, namely, *a plauſible Pretext for it.*—I anſwer, That there is no Likeneſs between the *Engliſh* and Popiſh Anniverſary-days, and ſeverals keeping a Part of the 18th of *February*, and imploying it in Thankſgiving and Prayer.—Here there was no Appointment, that the 18th Day of *February* ſhould be for ever obſerved as a Day for Thankſgiving upon the foreſaid Account.---Here there was no Impoſition upon any obliging them to obſerve it.—Theſe are ſome of the principal Things for which the *Engliſh* and Popiſh Anniverſary-days are condemned;—in this Caſe, there was no more than a voluntary and free Concert amongſt many good and zealous Chriſtians through the Land, to meet in their Societies for Prayer, and ſpend ſome Part of that Day in Thankſgiving and Prayer to God, and that they who could not meet that Day, would do it upon ſome other Day.—At *Kirkintulloch*, the Miniſter preached upon the 17th, and, as far as I know, they had their Meetings for foreſaid Purpoſe after Sermon.---In this Congregation we had a congregational Meeting by Concert, without any ſeſſional Appointment, and every Body were at Liberty to obſerve it

or

or not, as they pleaſed, and the Societies for Prayer met at Night.----The impoſing of Days lawful upon other Accounts, in a conſtant and ordinary Way, as Anniverſary-days and Feaſts are, is what we quarrel in the Church of *England*, as one Thing in this Controverſy. See Mr. *Durham* upon *the Commands*, Page 252.—How full is your Heart filled with Envy at this bleſſed Work, and all that are concerned in it?—So that we utterly deny, that there was a ſetting apart of any Anniverſary-day upon the mentioned Account;—and when you can bring any Authority appointing it, Civil or Eccleſiaſtical, to be obſerved laſt *February*, and ſo on next, and all enſuing Years, I ſhall acknowledge it was an Anniverſary-day, ſuch as theſe of the Church of *England*; but this you ſhall never be able to do.

2*dly*, You argue, *That the Day of* Pentecoſt *was the moſt memorable Day for the plentiful Effuſion of the Spirit that ever was, and yet did the Apoſtles and primitive Chriſtians obſerve that Day next Year, in Commemoration of that remarkable down-pouring of the Spirit upon them, on the ſaid Day the Year before?*---How do you know that they did not?—*We read of no ſuch Thing in the New Teſtament.*—What then? Will it follow, becauſe it is not recorded there, therefore they did it not?—Such a Way of arguing, you have been formerly told, is far from being good.—But what if they did not? What will you infer from this? Therefore I, or my Family, or a Set of Chriſtians with whom I am in particular Friendſhip, having received an extraordinary Bleſſing from God, may not lawfully next Year, ſet apart that Day, or ſome Part of it, for Thankſgiving to God, if nothing in Providence determine to the contrary?—May not my Friends by Concert, and voluntarily do the ſame.—An Inference that we may not, muſt have Support that you have not given as yet.—As to what you add, That Mr. *Livingſton*, and theſe converted at the *Kirk of Shots*, did not obſerve that Day Twelve-

month for Thankſgiving.—How know you, that Mr. *Livingſton* and theſe People did not? It will not follow they did it not, becauſe we have no Hiſtory that they did it.---But that all the Years they lived, as oft as that *Monday*, or Day of the Year came about, they never ſo much as thought, Now this very Day ſuch a Year, the Lord countenanced me in an extraordinary Manner, or begun my Converſion; never once minded to offer Thankſgiving to the moſt High for it, is what you ſhall never be able to prove was the Caſe; but, if it was, is their Example binding upon us to do the ſame?

Laſtly, You argue it is *contrary to our Principles as Preſbyterians*. I anſwer, If it had been keeping an Anniverſary-day, as it was not, yet where Superſtition, Neceſſity, and Impoſition of ſuch as holy, is laid aſide, tho' it be contrary to ſome other Chriſtian Principles, yet it is not contrary to Presbyterian Principles, which are purely confined to Principles of Government; for there are ſeveral Churches abroad as much Presbyterian as you or we are, who yet have ſeveral Anniverſary-days, as the Church of *Geneva*.--- The Concluſion of your Poſtſcript is the moſt uncharitable and profane, that ever came from a Man pretending to Goodneſs.

After all, my dear Sir, I am perſuaded, that you'll ſcarce find a Line in your *Preface* and *Review*, but what I have touched, as far as your Charge of Toleration-principles. Whether your Argument, contained in theſe Lines, is left untouched, I leave to the Reader to decide.---yet becauſe you boaſt, beginning your *Preface*, that your Argument againſt the Principles of the Promoters of this Work remains untouched, notwithſtanding the Reverend Mr. *Alexander Webſter* had given your Argument an overturning Touch, in as far as concerned himſelf; I ſhall therefore take a ſhort View of your Argument upon this Subject, and hope to ſhew you, that it is

weak,

weak, unfair, a confuſed Medley, and that therein you are Self condemned.

Page 43 of your *Review*, you enter upon the Conſideration of the Principles of the Promoters of this Work, eſpecially with reſpect to a boundleſs Toleration, and Liberty of Conſcience.---And again, P. 56, You ſay, *I hope, Mr.* Robe *will not henceforth reckon the Aſſociate Presbytery Slanderers, as he threatned to do, if they failed in the Probation of this Point.*--- Before I enter upon the Examination of your Probation of this Point, allow me to obſerve to the Reader, if this Point ſhould be proven, it will not free the Aſſociate Presbytery from being Slanderers;---for this was not the Slander, and I never put them to the Proof of this Point, otherways to be looked upon as Slanderers.---The Slander they threw out in their unparallelled Act was, That the Promoters of this Work did plead for a boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience. This Charge I inſiſted they ſhould make good, ſaying further, *Preface* Page 19. 20.---"If you do not, as I am ſure you cannot, it is "no Pleaſure to me, that you have given Reaſon to "the World to reckon you Slanderers."---Is it not ſtrange Confidence in you to ſay, that I threatened to reckon the Aſſociate Presbytery Slanderers, if they proved not the Point you have forged, and which they did not charge;---ſo that by your Performance, in making good your own Charge of lax Toleration-principles upon us, good or bad, you have left the Presbytery in the Lurch, and to be reckoned Slanderers, ſeeing you do not ſo much as offer to make good their falſe Charge.

Allow me, Sir, to obſerve ſome Things in this your Performance, before I come to Particulars, ſufficient to ſhew the Weakneſs of your Performance. ---As *firſt*, You have not told, whether it is a boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience to be granted by the Civil Magiſtrate to Men of all Denominations; or that the Church of Chriſt having a legal

Eſtabliſh-

Eſtabliſhment in *Scotland*, ſhould receive Sectarians of all Denominations into her Communion, Miniſterial or Chriſtian, or both theſe, that we are Favourers and Abettors of.---Chriſtian or even Pagan Morality ſhould have made you diſtinct, explicite and expreſs here.—2*dly*, Seeing you charge us with Principles, eſpecially with reſpect to a boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience, why have you not condeſcended upon theſe Principles, and expreſſed them diſtinctly in Propoſitions? This would have been a fair, honeſt and orderly Procedure.—The World would have been able to judge and cognoſce upon our Principles.—You indeed condeſcend upon one, which can have no Influence, unleſs it be for tolerating thoſe who differ from us, as to Church-Government,---which is far from what hath hitherto gone under the Name of a boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience.---Of this afterwards.---3*dly*, All the Proof you bring of theſe Principles, which we know not what they are, is only by unnatural Conſequences drawn from our Words.—This Way all judicious Men acknowledge to be unfair.—You complain of it in your own Caſe, as the Reverend Mr. *Williſon* obſerves in his Letter to you.—Your Words are, "Is it not a received Maxim, That no Man "ought to be condemned for Conſequences drawn "from his Doctrine when he diſclaims them? Is it "not vaſtly more agreeble to the Law of Love and "Charity, which *thinketh no Evil*, to put as favou-"rable a Conſtruction upon Mens Words as they "can poſſibly admit." Now, are you not ſelf-condemned here?—Have you a Right to deal with Men, other than they have to deal with you?---Have you in this followed our Lord's Rule?---*Whatever ye would that men ſhould do to you, do ye to them, for this is the law and the prophets*;---and therefore, a plain ſhort Anſwer might be ſufficient. We deny the Conſequences, and you have no Right to charge them upon us.

You

You begin the Charge, Page 43. with an Obſervation that will not hold true, as indeed very few of yours do,—namely, *That it hath been conſtantly obſerved, that the Ringleaders of Enthuſiaſm have ſtrenououſly ſet up for a boundleſs Liberty to all Sects and Opinions, eſpecially ſuch as relate to different Modes of Government and Policy in the Church of God.*—There have been Ringleaders of Enthuſiaſm, who have not done this,—particularly *Antoinette Bourignon*, who was againſt all Sects but her own.—Many other Inſtances may be given. There have been many far from Enthuſiaſm, who are for a very extenſive Toleration; ſuch as the great Dr. *Own*, and the whole moderate Part of the Church of *England*:—So that Ringleaders of Enthuſiaſm have been againſt tolerating any but themſelves, which I judge may quadrate pretty much with your own Sentiments; and there are innumerable Enemies to Enthuſiaſm, who are not for perſecuting and dragooning all who differ from them in Opinion.—So that you ſee, Sir, it would not have proven us to be Ringleaders of Enthuſiaſm, tho' you could have proven very extenſive Toleration-principles upon us.—For once I'll own to you frankly, that I am for the Governments tolerating you and your Party, tho' it be a greater Length than Dr. *Own* admits, in his pleading for Toleration,—and excepts them from the Benefit of it who caſt Dirt upon the better Way of Truth, *&c.*—As to what you add about the Government eſtabliſhed by Chriſt, I agree with you;—and therefore Satan hath planted you as the ſtrongeſt Battery againſt it, and done more Miſchief by you againſt the Walls and Bulwarks of *Zion*, than ever he could do by all his former Arts and Artillery:—And howſoever the Teſtimony and Sufferings of the Church of *Scotland* ſince the Reformation, hath been partly upon the Account of Church-government, yet I affirm your Teſtimony is not; and as for your Sufferings, inſtead of enduring any Hardſhips, there

are

are but few of you, if any, who have not mended your worldly Circumſtances by it;---in all which I neither envy nor begrudge you.

As to your Rhapſodies about the Origin and Progreſs of your Seceſſion, contained Pages 44, 45, 46.---tho' there is ſcarce a ſober and true Sentence, the Reverend Mr. *Currie* having unanſwerably expoſed all the bold Aſſertions you have, I meddle not with them; but confine myſelf to the Vindication of the Lord's Work from your blaſphemous Contradictions.

As to what you ſay, Pages 47, 48, that an Argument was taken from the ſovereignly gracious Outpouring of his Holy Spirit upon ſeveral Congregations in this Church, againſt your groundleſs and unwarrantable Schiſm and Separation from this Church; all this is very true; and the Argument itſelf is unanſwerable,---and which you have not ſo much as pretended to anſwer, except by a confident and ſhameleſs Aſſertion, that the Lord was not giving ſuch Tokens of his Preſence, as is alledged;---and that, 1*ſt*, *Becauſe they were going on in the ſame Courſe of backſliding from the Lord, as formerly*.---To this it is anſwered,---That, bleſſed be he who keeps us from falling, we were neither formerly, nor ſince going on in ſuch a Courſe of Backſliding, as was or is inconſiſtent with ſovereign Grace, ſeeing our Ways and healing them.---When you offer Proof of the Courſe of Backſliding we are going on in, that is an Evidence that this cannot be the Preſence of God, or Outleting of his Holy Spirit, that is given to ſuch, it ſhall be conſidered.---They are much to be pitied who take and credit your confident Aſſertions without Proof.--2*dly*, You give as an other Evidence that it cannot be the Preſence of God, becauſe of the Peoples Averſion and Prejudice to your Teſtimony.---You have formerly acknowledged, as alſo Mr. *Ralph Erskine*, that this is no Evidence that a Perſon is no good Chriſtian and unconverted,---and ſo it cannot be brought

brought by you as an Evidence that this is not a real Work of the Spirit of God, without contradicting yourſelf;---Page 48. the repeating what you ſay is enough to refute it,---*But as the Lord, in his great Mercy, hath by this Time made it evident to the whole Kingdom, that theſe Prophets have ſeen a lying Divination, ſo I need ſay the leſs upon it.*---This was written ſometime in *September* or *October* laſt Year.---How many are there through the whole Kingdom, who can declare, that either it is not evident to them what you aſſert, or that the contrary is evident to them.---See ſecond Edition of Mr. *Webſter's* Letter, marginal Notes, Pages 52, 53.

You add, *That all Pains is taken to ſecure the People, in all Time coming, from joining the Seceders*; and ſo much any are in the Way of their Duty, both to God and the Souls of Men, who do ſo, if they do it by reaſonable and Chriſtian Means,---*and from ever appearing zealous for Presbyterial Church-Government*;---This would be contrary to Duty,---and it is a falſe Charge.---We reckon that we may take all Pains to diſſuade them from ever joining the Seceders, and, at the ſame Time, perſuade them to a due Zeal for Presbyterial Church-Government;---yea, we cannot poſſibly perſuade them to a Zeal for Presbyterial Church-Government, without warning them againſt you, ſeeing you are juſt ſuch Enemies to Presbyterial Church-Government, as *Corah*, *Dathan* and *Abiram* were to the Government God then ſet over the Church and State of the Jews.---We indeed aſſert, that your *Teſtimony* is irregular, and many Ways ſinful,---that People of all Denominations, who are found in the Eſſentials of Chriſtians, may be good People, tho' they differ from one another in the Non-eſſentials.---That they ought to be more taken up about the Vitals of Religion, than about any leſſer or external Things.---Theſe are the Things we aſſert, teach and inculcate upon the People committed to our Charge, and ſo have our worthy and

godly

godly Forefathers done before us,---as I ſhall ſhew to the World, if the Lord permit, ſuppoſing you quarrel any of theſe.---It is plain, that this Doctrine opens no wide Door, to what I gueſs you call boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience, tho' it doth to Charity, and *forbearance of one another in love, and walking by the ſame rule, as far as we have attained*, ſo much recommended by the Holy Ghoſt.

We proceed now to conſider the Proof you bring againſt the Promoters of this bleſſed Work, of their having and maintaining Principles, of a boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience.--- You begin with the Reverend Mr. *Whitefield*, Page 49, here you refer the Reader, for Satisfaction as to his Principles, to Mr. *Gib*'s rational Performance, which I alſo do.--- They who can find Satisfaction there, cannot be the Objects of ordinary Means of Conviction.--- There are two Things, however, I ſhall take Notice of, *firſt*, That you ſay, *It cannot be refuſed, that Mr.* Whitefield *is the chief human Inſtrument and Promoter of this Work*; and afterwards, Page 67, you fall upon Mr. *Webſter*, alledging, *That he wants to ſhape out Mr.* Whitefield *from any Share of the Praiſe of the outpouring of the Spirit, as the prime Inſtrument thereof in* Scotland, *which you ſay is neither candid nor generous, and is alſo inconſiſtent with his own* Letter *to Mr.* Whitefield, Weekly-Hiſtory, *Num.* 27.---It is worth the Reader's While to turn to Mr. *Webſter*'s *Letter*, and ſee in what a clear and diſtinct Light he had ſet the Concern Mr. *Whitefield* had in this bleſſed Work; and how ſatisfyingly he removes the Prejudice taken by ſome againſt this good Work, from any Concern Mr. *Whitefield* had in it.---The Reader will find it, *Letter*, 2d *Edit.* Page 13. 14. and firſt *Edit.* Page 15.---18. I ſhall however tranſcribe Mr. *Webſter*'s marginal Note, in Anſwer to the above Charge, *Letter*, 2d *Edit.* Page 13.---Mr. "*Webſter* can-"not agree with the Reverend Author, in thinking "Praiſe proper to be aſcribed in any Caſe to the In-

ſtruments

"ſtruments of Converſion; and hopes never to be ſo "generous, as to give the Glory of the Down-pouring "of the Spirit to any Creature whatever; and deſires "ever to look beyond all Inſtruments, to Him with "whom is the Reſidue of the Spirit. It cannot eſcape "Obſervation, that Mr. *Fiſher* repreſents this Para-"graph, as *denying Mr.* Whitefield *to be the prime* "*Inſtrument of what Good is done of late in* Scot-"land;" tho' Mr. *Webſter* is expreſly ſpeaking only of Mr. *Whitefield*'s being out of the Queſtion, as to the Riſe of the extraordinary Concern upon the Minds of the People at *Cambuſlang*. And whereas Mr. *Fiſher* adds, " *That, in this Reſpect, Mr.* Webſter *is* "*not candid, and is alſo inconſiſtent with his own* "*Letter to Mr.* Whitefield: (*Glaſgow W. Hiſtory*, "Num. 27. *London ditto*, Num. 60.) Mr. *Webſter* ap-"peals to the *Letter*, where there is firſt an Account "given of the Succeſs of Mr. *Whitefield*'s Miniſtry "while here amongſt us; and then Mention is made "of what has happened ſince he left *Scotland*, and par-"ticularly the ſurpriſing Work at *Cambuſlang*. Is this "inconſiſtent with ſaying, that Mr. *Whitefield* did not "ſo much as preach there when laſt in *Scotland*, &c. "as in the above Paragraph? Where is the Diſingenu-"ity? Mr. *Webſter* chooſes rather that the Reader "ſhould judge what Anſwer this deſerves, than ex-"preſs his own Sentiments."

To declare this Matter as it is, once for all, and leave the Reader to judge for himſelf,---Mr. *White-field* came firſt to *Scotland* End of *July* 1741, that the Lord made Uſe of him, at that Time, as an In-ſtrument in his Hand, for the Converſion of ſeverals both at *Edinburgh* and *Glaſgow*, and probably ſome other Places, is undeniable.---At his leaving *North-Britain*, End of that Harveſt, there was no publick appearing Change to the better anywhere to be ob-ſerved, or greater Succeſs attending the Goſpel.---- The firſt Appearance was *February* 18th at *Cambuſ-lang*,-- and the great Part of the Awakening-work

was over, before Mr. *Whitefield* came there, about the 16th of *June* thereafter. --Here the firſt Appearance of the Out-pouring of the Holy Spirit was, upon the of *April*, there was great Progreſs in this Work before Mr. *Whitefield* preached here, *June* 15. upon his ſecond coming to *Scotland*, --- *Sabbath* before ſaid 15th of *June*, there were Fifteen awakened. Upon the ſaid Day Mr. *Whitefield*, Mr. *Jack* Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Biggar*, and I preaching, there were alſo Fifteen, whoſe Awakening came firſt that Day to my Knowledge, tho' I find by my Book, ſome of them had a Wakening before, but were able to conceal it. --- The ſecond Time he preached here was about the Middle of *Auguſt*, when there was only one from the Pariſh of *Campſy* known to me to be awakened that Day.---It is to be obſerved, That I had never ſeen Mr. *Whitefield* before his coming to *Kilſyth*, Time mentioned, nor had any Correſpondence with him, except by the Letter inviting him to *Kilſyth*; and that there were not a Score in the Pariſh of *Kilſyth*, who had heard him when in *Scotland* firſt. --- There were alſo theſe Pariſhes, where this bleſſed Work hath made conſiderable Progreſs, in which Mr. *Whitefield* never preached, --- ſome of the Miniſters not having Clearneſs to invite him, and others who invited him, being diſappointed, namely, *Kirkintilloch*, *Campſy*, *Gargunnock*, *St. Ninians*, *Muthel* and *Crief*;---ſo the Reader may ſee, there is no Reaſon to connect this Affair with Mr. *Whitefield*,---or in a ſneering Way, to give out Mr. *Whitefield*'s being the prime human Inſtrument, *&c.* --- The Lord was pleaſed to make Uſe of Mr. *Whitefield* as an Inſtrument in awakening Sinners, in ſome of theſe Places where this Work was remarkable, as he had done others of his Servants before Mr. *Whitefield*'s coming, and after it,---and we rejoiced at it;--- and ſo would you, if you were like unto the godly reforming Miniſters of the laſt Century;---they would have rejoiced in his Succeſs in awakening Sinners,

and

and made Uſe of him with all the Faults he hath. As worthy Mr. *Robert Blair* tells, he and others rejoiced at the Lord's making Uſe of Mr. *James Glendinning*, in awakening many Sinners in theſe Bounds, and by what I can find, was the firſt Inſtrument of the Awakening in that Part of *Ireland*, yet they rejoiced at it, tho' Mr. *Glendinning* underſtood not the Goſpel-way of Salvation, which cannot be ſaid of Mr. *Whiteſield*.---This, I hope, will ſet this Matter in a clear Light for the Time to come.

2*dly*, I obſerve, that he chargeth this falſe Principle upon Mr. *Whiteſield*, *That there is no Foundation in Scripture or Reaſon, for any one particular Form of Church-Government by another*. That this is Mr. *Whiteſield*'s Principle, we have only your bold Aſſertion for it;-- but if it be, it will be far from making him a Heretick, and it is no Principle inconſiſtent with ſaving Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, or Orthodoxy in the Eſſentials of Chriſtianity,---being Latitudinarian in Principle, as to Church-Government, is no greater Error, than being Epiſcopal or Independent,---which our Church and reforming Forefathers never thought inconſiſtent with either.--However, this falſe Principle is what you undertake to prove is the Principle of theſe you call the ſubordinate Promoters of this Work; (let the Reader judge, whether this Way of ſpeaking be like an old malicious Wife, or a Divine)---and therefore, I ſhall keep it in my Eye, and endeavour to keep you to it;---only I declare, that I and my Brethren in *Scotland* ſolemnly profeſſed and ſubſcribed the direct contrary to this falſe Principle when we were licenced and ordained, to which we yet adhere; believing, profeſſing and maintaining, that the Presbyterial Government eſtabliſhed in the Church of *Scotland* is founded upon the Word of God, and conform thereto;---and do diſown foreſaid falſe Principle; and therefore, tho' you could draw ſuch a Conſequence from any Words of ours, you can never juſtly charge us with it, ſeeing we

refuſe

refuſe and diſown it as much as you;---but even this you ſhall never be able to do, as your preſent Attempt to do it, and the Management of it is ridiculous and Romantick, which I proceed to ſhew.

You'll mind then, Sir, as I hope the Reader alſo will, that the particular falſe Principle you engage to prove upon us, is, That there is no Foundation in Scripture and Reaſon for any one particular Form of Church-Government.---You begin with the Reverend Mr. *Gilbert Tennent*, and other Adherents to Mr. *Whitefield*, of the Presbyterian Denomination in *New England*.—The Proof you bring, that he and they maintain the foreſaid Principle, is the Proteſtation you formerly mentioned, preſented to the Synod of *Philadelphia*, wherein it is ſaid, Page 9, "That they "expreſly deny that Presbyteries and Synods have "Authority, or ſhould go any further in judging "of Appeals or References, *&c.* than to give their "beſt Advice, which (ſay the Proteſtant Miniſters) "is plainly to diveſt the Officers and Judicatories of "Chriſt's Kingdom of all Authority, and plainly "contradicts our *Confeſſion of Faith*, Chap. 31. "Sect. 3."—You, as I hope the Reader will, may ſee from Page 27 of my third *Letter*, what Regard is to be had to this Proteſtation.—If it had the leaſt Reference to the Principle in Queſtion, will any Perſons of Candor and Equity admit a Proteſtation of their Adverſaries, as Proof of it againſt them? A Proteſtation that the Synod itſelf certainly had no Regard to?--A Proteſtation, without knowing firſt what Anſwer Mr. *Tennent* and others have made to it?—This would be ſeceding Proof with a Witneſs.—Further, admit this Proteſtation as good Proof againſt Mr. *Tennent* and Presbyterian Miniſters, Adherents to Mr. *Whitefield* in *Penſilvania*, who belong to that Synod; How can you bring it as Proof againſt Miniſters of the Presbyterian Denomination, Adherents to Mr. *Whitefield* in *New England*, who are not ſubject to the Synond of *Penſilvania*, and ſo not intend-

ed

ed in the foreſaid Proteſtation?—And, *laſtly*, Grant that all the Proteſters ſay is true, namely, *That they expreſly deny, that Presbyteries and Synods have Authority, or ſhould judge of Appeals and References, further than to give their beſt Advice*; Will it follow from this, that it is their Principle, *That there is no Foundation in Scripture or Reaſon, for any one particular Form of Church-Government by another.*—Do not our Brethren of the Congregational or Independent Way aſſert, That Synods can go no further than give their beſt Advice; and yet they aſſert, That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt hath inſtituted the Congregational and Independent Form of Government,—and are as far from admitting the falſe Principle as you are;—ſo that, if it were Fact what the Proteſters aſſert, it can never prove, that they admit the falſe Principle in Queſtion.

Next Paragraph you add, "That Mr. *Gilbert Tennent* in particular, is entirely moulded into Mr. *Whiteſield*'s Catholick Scheme, of blending all religious Societies into one, to make up a Synagogue of Satan out of all.'—This is writ ſo much in Mr. *Gib*'s modeſt and Chriſtian Stile, that I leave it to animadvert upon itſelf;—But how doth even this very religious and godly Intention of Mr. *Tennent*'s appear?—*It will appear*, add you, *from Mr.* Whiteſield's *Character of him*, Remarks, *&c.* Page 8. "I have the Happineſs of being perſonally and very intimately acquainted with Mr. *Tennent*." *I ſcarce know a Man of a more Catholick Spirit.*—Now what appears from this? Let the Reader pleaſe to look about, and ſee what horrid Spectre will come upon the Stage.—Mr. *Tennent* is a Man of a Catholick Spirit beyond the moſt Mr. *Whiteſield* knew; Doth this appear, from his being ſo, that he was a Factor for the Devil to ſet up a Synagogue of Satan? Doth it appear from it, that Mr. *Tennent* was of this Principle, that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had not inſtituted one Form of Government by another? You might

as

as well infer this from the Commendation of the *Theſſalonians*, and other Chriſtians, for their Love towards all Men.

This falſe Principle is next charged upon Meſſrs. *Web*, *Prince* and *Coupar*, three eminent Miniſters of the Congregational Perſuaſion at *Boſton*.—The Proof againſt them is, that Mr. *Whiteſield*'s *Remarks*, P. 24. *Shews how far they are from Bigotry, by their Preface to Mr.* MacGreger's *Sermon*, (who is a Miniſter of the Presbyterian Perſuaſion) *which concludes thus*, "And our earneſt Wiſhes, that with a tender and "meek Forbearance of each other, in different Sen-"timents about Church-order and Government, we "may all unite in maintaining and promoting theſe "more excellent and momentuous Points of Grace "and vital Piety."—Now, will any rational Being, in the Exerciſe of Reaſon, infer, That theſe valuable and worthy Brethren, are highly deſirous that the Brethren of the Presbyterian Perſuaſion there, and they, ſhould meekly and tenderly forbear one another in their different Sentiments about Church-Government, that they may maintain the Doctrines of Grace, and of the greateſt Importance, and aſſiſt one another in the great Work of converting Sinners, which are more excellent and momentuous Points, than theſe concerning Church-order and Government; that therefore they think no Form of Government, founded upon Scripture or Reaſon, by another?—They think each Side may retain their Sentiments about the particular Forms of Church-Government, and yet may unite to maintain the eſſential Doctrines of Chriſtianity and Grace, in Oppoſition to *Socinians*, *Arminians*, and others, and may aſſiſt one another in the great Work of *turning ſinners from darkneſs to light, and from the power of Satan to God*.—If you be of different Sentiments, and had rather the Doctrines of Grace, of the greateſt Importance, ſhould be dropt, and Sinners ſhould go to Hell, as join with any who differ from you in the leaſt and

moſt

moſt diſputable Point of Church-Order and Government, to maintain theſe Doctrines, and carry on ſuch a good Work of Converſion, I judge you'll get few really Chriſtian Readers to approve of your Sentiments, and I wiſh I had it not to ſay, your preſent Practice.

You boldly aſſert, That Mr. *Edwards* is of the ſame falſe Principle mentioned, and ſay, it may be ſeen from the Cloſe of his Sermon, on the *Marks of a Work of the true Spirit*.—If the Reader try, he will find that you have added this to your other Slanders of this good Man.

Mr. *Harris* comes next to be tried,—tho' I am not acquaint with this Gentleman's Principles, yet I think the Proof you bring, that he is an Eſpouſer of the foreſaid falſe Principle, is far from proving it.—You take it from *Weekly-Hiſtory*, Num. 14.—"Since we "cannot come to underſtand ſome Texts about "Church-Government, and about the Mode and "Time of Baptiſm, and ſome other little Externals "that are ſoon to periſh, all Miniſters,—of every "Perſuaſion, ſhould lend their Pulpits to each other "alternately, never touching on theſe Things they "cannot ſee alike."—And you ſay, This was exactly the Dialect of the Familiſts, and the Enthuſiaſts of the laſt Century.—This is not now the Queſtion, whether it was their Dialect or not;—but whether theſe Words of Mr. *Harris* expreſs this falſe Principle, THAT THERE IS NO FOUNDATION IN SCRIPTURE OR REASON, FOR ANY ONE PARTICULAR FORM OF CHURCH-GOVERNMENT BY ANOTHER. This is what you undertook to prove was Mr. *Harris* Principle;—but you have not ſo much as attempted to ſhew, how it may be juſtly inferred from his Words;—whether the Words themſelves was the Language of the Familiſts or not,—I am ſure it was the Practice of the moſt eminent reforming Miniſters amongſt our Foreſathers,—as Mr. *Rutherford*, with Archbiſhop *Uſher*, Mr.

Mr. *Robert Blair*, Mr. *John Livingſton*, and other godly Miniſters, with the prelatical Party in *Ireland*, who were willing to join with them, as may be ſeen from Mr. *Blair*'s *Life*, and other Hiſtories of theſe Times;—particularly Mr. *Blair* tells, Page *mihi* 42. of his Life, That a Dean being ſent to reſide at *Craig-fergus*, to counteract and bear them down,—ſome of them waited on him, and invited him to concur with them in the monthly Meeting at *Antrim*.—They were not like unto you, who had rather your Maſter's Work, in the Converſion of Sinners, ſhould miſcarry and be marred, as either give Aſſiſtance to; or take Aſſiſtance from any who differ from you in the leaſt external Point.—Theſe great Men were of another Spirit.

The Reader will now judge of your Performance, in proving the foreſaid Principle, of boundleſs Toleration and Liberty of Conſcience, upon the foreign Divines, who are Promoters of this Work, and from your manifeſt failing therein, will expect no great Deal from the Proof you lead againſt the Promoters thereof at Home.

You begin, Page 50, with the Reverend Mr. *John Williſon* Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Dundee*.—The Reader will doubtleſs be amazed at your Confidence, that when he hath wrote ſo many Volumes upon various Subjects, and even upon the Head of Church-Government and Order, you cannot find this falſe Principle in any of theſe Volumes, which you would if you could; but adduce the Poſtſcript of a Letter as your only Proof.—The Words are, *Weekly-Hiſtory*, Num. 13. "Many with us are for preferring Miniſters according to the Party they are of; but commend me to a pious, Chriſt-exalting and Soul-winning Miniſter, whatever be his Denomination."—Now, Reader, doth this ſay, that there is no Foundation in Scripture or Reaſon, for one Form of Church-Government or Order by another? Doth the Reverend Mr. *Williſon* inſinuate by theſe Words

any

any ſuch Thing?—Doth he ſay, that he would make a Jeſuite welcome; ſeeing no Jeſuite can be a pious, Chriſt-exalting and Soul-winning Miniſter?---and that he is ſpeaking of Miniſters of the Proteſtant Denomination, found in Eſſentials of Faith, and who differ from one another only in the Non-eſſentials. The Reader may ſee Mr. *Williſon*'s own Anſwer, in his excellent and fatherly Letter to Mr. *Fiſher*.—*Each day they wreſt my words.*—But now, dear Brother *Fiſher*, ſince you have your Hand in, let us hear what you can make of theſe expreſs Words of your Friend Mr. *Ralph Erskine*,—Fraud and Falſhood, Page 50.---*I had no Scruple to ſpeak with Thankfulneſs of their Succeſs, nor to ſubſcribe myſelf their affectionate Brother, even tho' they were as yet Prieſts of the Church of* England, *yet ſeemingly penitent Ones, beginning to come out of, and witneſs againſt all the Corruptions of that Church; yea, tho' they had not only ſworn the Supremacy, and abjured the Solemn League and Covenant, but ſubſcribed the* Turkiſh *Alcoran too, who could juſtly upbraid me for paying brotherly Regards, or giving brotherly Salutations to them, while I had Ground to judge them repenting, returning and reforming Brethren? I think I would kindly welcome a reforming Prieſt of the Church of* Rome, *and yet be conſiſtent with myſelf, if I had ſufficient Documents of his putting his Hand to Reformation-work.*—Now, had Mr. *Erskine* any the leaſt Document, that theſe Prieſts of the Church of *England* had altered their Sentiments in the leaſt as to Epiſcopacy, or the Supremacy, while he was bleſſing for their Succeſs, and giving them the Right-hand of Fellowſhip, by ſubſcribing himſelf their affectionate Brother?—It is not ſo much as what can be pretended;---And would our Brother welcome a *Mahometan* or Jeſuite, upon the ſame Evidences of Repentance, he had from theſe Prieſts of the Church of *England*? Now, Sir, tell honeſtly for once, what Inferences you would have drawn from theſe Words, had you found them dropt

from the Pen of Mr. *Williſon*, or any of the Promoters of this bleſſed Work? — I leave all this to the Reader's own Sentiments.

You bring the Reverend Mr. *Ogilvie*, Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Aberdeen* next upon the Stage.—You ſay, Page 51. *He is far from diſſembling his Keenneſs for Toleration-principles*, Weekly-Hiſtory, Num. 28. "We have been of late much employed, and a "great Noiſe has been made about the leſſer Mat"ters of the Law, and are now much broken in "Judgment about Things, many of which, I muſt "own, I do not well underſtand."—You interpret the leſſer Matters of the Law, to be Church-Order and Government. — Who gave you a Right to put ſuch an Interpretation upon his Words? That the Meaning you put upon them is falſe, is evident from this, that we had no Conteſt with you, or any Body elſe about Church-Government, or the Principles of it.—You and we were agreed as to that.—This appears, you ſay, *from his Character of Mr.* Whitefield, "His Attachment (ſays he) to no Party but "Chriſt, and true Grace alone has long appeared "to me a peculiar Excellency in him."—Now, let the Reader ſay, if theſe Words expreſs or imply, that there is no Foundation in Scripture or Reaſon, for one Form of Church-Government by another. — I paſs your trembling at the pretended Blaſphemy, of ſaying Mr. *Whitefield* is attached to no Party but Chriſt, tho' he hath ſhewn it more than any Man in his Time, his Inwards muſt be left to the Searcher of Hearts.—Only you could not miſs to be diſſatisfied with yourſelf, when you fell a trembling, and found yourſelf under the Influence of a deluſive and evil Spirit; for you ſay, The good Spirit is ſedate and calm in his Influences, and they never have ſuch Effects upon the Bodies of Men.—You further add, *That the Words, true Grace alone, ſhew that the Truths relative to the Order and Government of the Houſe of God, are with* Mr. Ogilvie *Matters of Indifference*;

difference; and therefore, according to him, not worth contending for, because no Way essential to Salvation.—Whosoever commends a Man, because he is attached to no Party, but to true Grace alone, reckons all other Truths not essential to Salvation, indifferent, is such an Assertion that no reasonable Person will swallow, without Proof; and here there is none but your bare Word.—As to your Quotation from the Reverend Mr. *Bisset*'s Sermon, I heartily agree with him, in reckoning it a very great Evil, to look upon any of the Truths of Christ as Indifferences, and know none of the Promoters of this Work who do so.—And tho' our Reverend Brother and I differ as to our Sentiments about Mr. *Whitefield*, yet I purpose to enter into no Controversy with him,—because I look upon him as acting very much like an honest Man, according to the Measure of his Light, which he hath shewn, in dealing very freely and honestly with you and your Brethren, in his *Letter*. He tells you the Truth freely, and without Reserve. As also, by what I can learn from his *Letter*, he hath not shewn himself an Enemy to this blessed Work.

You proceed to prove your Charge against the Reverend Mr. *Webster* and me.—Your feasible Transition I leave to the Reader's Animadversion.—The Proof you bring, that Mr. *Webster* is persuaded, *That there is no Foundation in Scripture or Reason, for any Form of Church-Order or Government, by another*; for this is still the Point you are to prove, is, that Page 30. *Letter*, first *Edit.*—he saith, "A Person "under alarming Apprehensions of Divine Wrath, "cannot with much Sedateness of Mind peruse the "endless Volumes that have been writ on visible "external Forms.—What would you think of his "Convictions for Sin, who made Church-Government his first Enquiry? Would he not be as reasonably and profitably employed in reading *Gutherie*'s *Trial*, as in studying publick Acts and Testimonies." Here is the Proof;—Is it possible, that

any

any Reader in the Exerciſe of Reaſon, will give his Verdict from it, — that Mr. *Webſter* is guilty? — Is there any one contemptuous Word here of the Government and Diſcipline of the Houſe of the living God, as you ſay every one will obſerve? Pray, dear Sir, point us to the Word. — But you ſay, *The Spirit of God doth not, in his convincing Work, beget in any Soul an Averſion to publick Acts and Teſtimonies for the declarative Glory of God, as evidently takes Place at preſent in Mr.* Webſter *himſelf, and theſe he is pleading for.* — Now, Sir, the Reader asks at you, Where Mr. *Webſter* ſaith this? For he cannot find it in the probatory Paſſage you preſent him with. — The Reader looks a few Paragraphs before the Paſſage you quote, and there they find Mr. *Webſter* aſſerting, "That a Deſire to promote the Glory of "God, is indeed neceſſarily connected with a real "Concern for our own Salvation. When Chriſt "dwells in the Heart, he will be confeſſed with "the Lip, — and that the Children of *Zion* natu-"rally ſeek the Good of *Zion*, and, when in a due "Exerciſe of Grace, *prefer Jeruſalem to their chiefeſt* "*joy*, — and that the Intereſt of Chriſt's viſible ex-"ternal Kingdom is dear to them." They find him directly aſſerting himſelf a Presbyterian, — and "that "good Men in their proper Spheres endeavour to "promote the Intereſts of Chriſt's viſible external "Kingdom." Tho' the Reverend Mr. *Webſter*, and other good People may have an Averſion at ſuch a publick *Act and Teſtimony* as yours is; yet the Reader is amazed at your confident Libel againſt Mr. *Webſter*, as aſſerting, That it is not worth any Body's While to be taken up about Presbyterial Government, and that no Perſon needs be in the leaſt concerned about the Matter of Church-Government. When you had theſe very Paſſages, ſo contradictory to the Calumny, in your Eye, the Reader may ſee Mr. *Webſter*'s own Anſwer, *Letter*, 2d *Edit.* marg. Note, Page 26. 27.

You

You add, Page 54. *That he makes two inſulting Challenges from Mr.* Robe's *Preface with equal Warmth, to the ſeceding Miniſters.* (1) "Dare any "of you tell the moſt zealous for your Teſtimony, "and againſt their own Miniſters, that theſe Things "are Marks and Evidences of ſaving Grace?"—Where the inſulting is in putting theſe Queſtions to the ſeceding Miniſters in the ſtrongeſt Terms, and with Warmth, let the Reader judge. Have not you and your Brethren cried up your *Teſtimony*, as it were the only Standard of true Religion? Have not you, above ſeven or eight Times in your *Preface* and *Review*, at leaſt inſinuate, that Averſion to your Teſtimony is an Evidence, that both the Promoters and Subjects of this Work, are not of God, but of the Devil? Have not you and the *Aſſociate Presbytery* ſpoke, as if you cared not much tho' the People ſhould look upon Adherence to your *Teſtimony*, as an Evidence of true Grace, and Averſion to it, an Evidence of a contrary Eſtate?—Was there not then the higheſt Reaſon to preſs you to be expreſs and explicite upon this Head, to prevent Peoples being deceived by ſuch falſe Marks and Evidences?—The Reader will eaſily obſerve the great Importance of theſe Queſtions, conſidered either in themſelves, or in their Connection, both in Mr. *Webſter*'s *Letter* and my *Preface*;—and yet tho' both he and I have preſſed an Anſwer to theſe Queſtions, it hath been to no Purpoſe. You have given the moſt ſhifting and evaſive Anſwer poſſible, tho' preventing the Deſtruction of Sinners, by ſuch inſufficient Marks and Evidences of Grace, required a direct and clear Anſwer.—Before you Anſwer the firſt, you ſay, *You won't inſiſt upon the Invective of calling it our* Teſtimony. Was there ever any Thing ſo extravagant writ?—Pray, Sir, whoſe *Teſtimony* is it? Do not you and your Brethren call it your *Teſtimony*, and boaſt of it as your peculiar Honour? Where then is the Invective?

The

The evaſive ſhifting Anſwer you give to the firſt Query is, *I dare tell every one, That a zealous Concern for a publick Teſtimony to the Kingly Office of Chriſt, and the Privileges of his Kingdom is among the diſtinguiſhing Evidences of ſaving Grace, which we find all the Saints in Scripture had, every one of them being zealous for the* Teſtimony *of their Day.* —Upon this I obſerve, 1*ſt*, That as Mr. *Webſter* hath obſerved, *Pref.* to 2d *Edit.* of his *Divine Influence*, Page 5th, you are not yet ſo hardy as make an Approbation of your *Acts* and *Teſtimony*, eſſential to a State of Grace. I aſſert that your *Teſtimony* is not ſuch a Teſtimony as is contained in your Anſwer, and do again put you to it, to ſay that it is,—ſo that your Anſwer doth not meet with the Queſtion at all.—But, 2*dly*, The Anſwer you give is far from containing Truth, and that upon a twofold Account, 1*ſt*, Many have had a zealous Concern for, and have given a Teſtimony to the Kingly Office of Chriſt, and the Privileges thereof, who were not Saints, but rejected by Jeſus Chriſt, as Workers of Iniquity.—*Matth.* vii. 21. *Not every one that ſaith to me, Lord, Lord, ſhall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven.*—2*dly*, All the Scripture Saints, and others in After-ages, have always had a zealous Concern for a publick Teſtimony to fundamental Truths, relating to the Kingly Office of Chriſt, and the Privileges thereof; yet they have not had always a zealous Concern for non-fundamental Truths relating to his Kingly Office, and a publick Teſtimony for them, but might be ignorant of theſe, and through Ignorance or Miſtake, zealous againſt them. Innumerable Inſtances might be given.—The Diſciples of Jeſus Chriſt, tho' real Believers, were for ſome Years, ſo far from being zealous for that publick Teſtimony he gave to the Spirituality of his Kingdom, that all that Time they entertained the Opinion, for which they were very

zealous,

zealous, that he was to ſet up an earthly Kingdom.' —The aboliſhing the ceremonial Law after the Reſurrection of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſetting up a ſpiritual Worſhip ſuitable to his ſpiritual Kingdom, belonged to the Kingly Office of Jeſus Chriſt, and yet real Chriſtians were for a long Time divided in their Opinion about this Matter;—and tho' it was the preſent Truth, and the Teſtimony of the Day, yet many good Chriſtians were zealouſly contrary to this.—And the Apoſtles exhorted Chriſtians to mutual Forbearance, until this Affair was ſufficiently cleared up; telling them, that God accepted both Sides, who were real Believers, notwithſtanding this Difference of Sentiments. See *Rom.* xiv. and xv. Chapters.—The bleſſed Martyres, *Cranmer*, *Ridley*, &c. who ſuffered for Chriſt in the bloody *Marian* Days, none of them gave a Teſtimony againſt Epiſcopacy, or the King's Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, altho' you know they are contrary to the Kingly Office of Jeſus Chriſt, and the Privileges thereof. —Your judicious Mark ſcores them all out of the Number of Saints, as it doth all our holy Brethren living in the Communion of the Epiſcopal Churches of all Degrees, or congregational Churches. —Is this the diſtinguiſhing Mark and Evidence of Grace, you and Mr. *Ralph Erskine* have boaſted of as preferable to Faith in Jeſus Chriſt, Love to him, Love to the Brethren, a new Creature, and other Marks given by Mr. *Webſter*, Mr. *Robe*, and other Promoters of this Work.—I do hereby give my Teſtimony againſt it, and warn all to whom this Preſents may come to beware of it.

The ſecond Challenge given by Mr. *Webſter* and me was, "Dare any of you tell them,—that the "judging your *Teſtimony* irregular, and what the "Lord required not at your Hands in the Way "and Manner you have given it, and their cloſe "Conjunction with their Miniſters, are certain Evi-"dences that they are chriſtleſs and graceleſs who

"do

"do ſo!"——To this you anſwer, *That if ſome Perſons had not better Evidences of their being in a State of Grace, than their judging the* Teſtimony *we were honoured to give, to be irregular, and their cloſs Conjunction with their Miniſters, who are carrying on a Courſe of Defection; it would be no great Breach of Charity to ſay they are graceleſs and chriſtleſs who do ſo.*—What occaſioned theſe Queſtions, particularly this laſt was, That the *Aſſociate Presbytery*, in their *Dumferline* Act, aſſign theſe among the Fruits of this Work, and Evidences of its being deluſive.—Whether Mr. *Fiſher* hath anſwered the Queſtion or not, the Reader may judge.—And whether he acts a faithful Part to the Souls of Men or not, in declining to anſwer it?—The Reader may obſerve, and tell every Body, That Mr. *Fiſher* dare not ſay, that Averſion to their *Teſtimony*, and cloſs Conjunction with the Miniſters of the Church of Jeſus Chriſt eſtabliſhed in *Scotland*, is any Evidence that ſuch Perſons are graceleſs and chriſtleſs.—After all the Proof brought againſt the Reverend Mr. *Webſter*, I am perſuaded he comes off in the Opinion of every unbyaſſed Reader not guilty, which you, Sir, won't do.

You next bring Proof againſt me not of what I had called upon the *Aſſociate Presbytery* to prove, or elſe be reckoned Slanderers, namely, THEY STRENUOUSLY PLEAD FOR A BOUNDLESS TOLERATION, AND LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE, AS THE ONLY THING THAT CAN UNITE AND MAKE CHRISTIANS HAPPY ONE AMONG ANOTHER.—This was their publick Slander. This was what I inſiſted they ſhould make good. Inſtead of this you proceed to prove that I am of this, and other worſe Toleration-principles, *viz.* That THERE IS NO FOUNDATION IN SCRIPTURE OR REASON FOR ONE FORM OF CHURCH ORDER AND GOVERNMENT BY ANOTHER. *This*, you ſay, *you find*

find no Difficulty in doing:—For 1ſt, *He inſinuates plainly, That the Decay of practical Godlineſs, Formality in Religion, and open Immorality, are the only Breaches of Covenant*, Page 4. *Pref.*—But how do you prove this? The Words you adduce are, "All this was obſerved by ſome, and look'd upon "as the Cauſe of God's Controverſy with us, and "what they feared would provoke him to ſend "ſome deſolating Judgment to avenge the Quarrel "of his THUS broken Covenant." Now, Reader, judge, Is there any Inſinuation here, that theſe Sins are the only Breaches of Covenant? Are they not Breaches of Covenant? And is not the Lord's Covenant broken by them, a *thus* broken Covenant? Doth the ſpeaking ſo inſinuate, that there are no other Breaches of Covenant than theſe I have mentioned?—Is it plain from this, that I look upon all Defections from Presbyterial Principles in Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government, to be no Breaches of our Covenants, as Mr. *Fiſher* alledges?—There is not the leaſt Inſinuation giving Ground for ſuch a Charge.—There are ſeveral poſſible Defections from theſe, that I aſſert would be Breaches of theſe Covenants, if they were Fact, which cannot be charged upon the Church of *Scotland*,—and it is not Defection as to the Principles of Doctrine, Worſhip, Diſcipline and Government, that hath been our provoking and crying Sin: For I had obſerved in the very Paragraph of my *Preface* you refer to, tho' you take no Notice of it, that the Government, Worſhip and Doctrine eſtabliſhed in this Church, are retained in Profeſſion,—and ſo long as our Standards are retained, profeſſed, and made Terms of miniſterial Communion in their full Extent, and obvious literal Meaning, the Church cannot be charged with Defection from theſe Principles ſhe acknowledgeth, profeſſeth, and adheres to.—Further, admit your wreſting of my Words, that theſe Sins are the only Breaches of Covenant, can you infer from it,

that I am of Opinion, that THERE IS NO FOUNDATION IN SCRIPTURE OR REASON FOR ANY ONE FORM OF CHURCH-GOVERNMENT AND ORDER, BY ANOTHER? May I not think the Presbyterian Government is founded upon Scripture, and yet be of Opinion, that the Church of *Scotland* hath made no Defection from it, as is either a Breach of Covenant, or such a Breach of it as cries for Vengeance, as our other Sins do?

Your second Proof is one of the boldest Calumnies in your whole Paper. Page 55.—you say, *That I make it one of Satan's Devices for People to be exercised about publick Defections, which (says he) either are not their Sins, or among the least of them.*— 1*st*, 'Tis a gross Falshood that I assert, or ever did any where assert, *That it is one of Satan's Devices for People to be exercised about publick Defections.*— 2dly, *That I assert, that these publick Defections are not a Peoples Sins, or among the least of them*,—is as false. I refer the Reader to Pages 4th and 5th of my *Preface*; he will find no such Thing there: And I dare Mr. *Fisher* to make good this gross Alledgance, which I utterly deny.

3*dly*, You alledge another Falshood,—*That I make Mismanagement in Government and Discipline to be no Causes, or, at least, very inconsiderable ones, of the Lord's Controversy with us; for I find great Fault with these who complained of publick Defections and Backslidings, as the most crying Sins.* Where do I find Fault with any for complaining of publick Defections and Backslidings? Do I not complain, that several good Men do not notice them? but were taken up about some Mismanagements in Government and Discipline, as the most crying Sins, overlooking our greatest Evil, our publick Defection and Backsliding, and the Cause of God's Controversy with us, the Corruption and Wickedness of the Members of this Church, *&c.*—You add,—That you wish Mr. *Robe* would remember, *That the Corruption*

tion

tion of the Lives of Church-Members, flows chiefly, next to the Depravation of their Natures, from the Corruptions of the Miniſtry.——I wiſh Mr. *Fiſher* had remembered, That the Corruption of the Miniſtry was included in the Corruption of the Lives of the Members of this Church, *&c.*—and I am perſuaded, that there is that Corruption and Degeneracy in the Faith and Practice of ſome of the Miniſtry, as calls as loud for Vengeance from Heaven, as that of the other Church-Members.—I alſo acknowledge, that the Corruption of the Faith, and Morals of the Miniſtry, is one Cauſe of the Corruption of the other Church-Members,—of which you are a ſad Inſtance, as well as, alas, too many in this Church;—but that Miſmanagement in ſome Inſtances in Government and Diſcipline is ſuch a Corruption, I confidently deny;—for with many it may proceed from Miſtake, Weakneſs, Miſrepreſentation of Cauſes, Want of Ability for Government, and not from Wickedneſs or bad Principles: But what of all this? What do you infer from it? Will you infer that I am for no Church-Government, as inſtituted by Chriſt, and for boundleſs Liberty of Conſcience, becauſe I think the Miſmanagement in Government and Diſcipline, in this Church, are not our moſt crying Sins?—They who have a Mind to make ſuch an Inference with you, are no further to be reaſoned with.

Your fourth Proof is, you ſay, *That I call the Defections of Miniſters and Church-judicatories diſputable Things, and far from the Vitals of Religion*, Page 5.—For Anſwer, *firſt*, I have not ſaid ſo, either in that Page, or anywhere elſe.—*2dly*, If I had ſaid ſo, it would have been Fact,—that ſeveral Things, alledged to be Defections, are diſputable Things, and have been always ſo,—and conſequently are far from the Vitals of Religion.—What you add is far from being Truth, *That I ſpeak diminutively of our publick Defections, and Matters relative to the Govern-*

ment

ment of the Houſe of Chriſt;---for here I am not ſpeaking of our publick Defections, which I have condeſcended upon as crying Sins.---What you add is without Meaning and Proof, *That it neceſſarily lands in Scepticiſm, which is the native Fruit of Enthuſiaſm.*---You add, *That I go upon a palpable Miſtake, that none who are taken up about the Vitals of Religion, will much concern themſelves about the publick Cauſe of God.*—It is a vile Imputation, that I go upon ſuch a Miſtake, and is to be charged to the reſt of your Calumnies.—I know no Miniſters inculcate ſuch Things upon their Hearers;—but yet, at the ſame Time, every diſputable Opinion is not to be reckoned the publick Cauſe of God.—And to make the ſame Noiſe for the moſt circumſtantial Truths, as ſhould be made for fundamental Points, is far from that Zeal which is according to Knowledge,—and to lead poor People of weak Judgment, who have but little Time to read, or to employ even about the Vitals of Religion, to doubtful Diſputations, or to Debates they are not capable to judge in, is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and a manifeſt Deſtruction of their Souls.

After all, you have not ſo much as brought the leaſt Argument to prove what you undertook; you have not ſo much as endeavoured to infer your Charge, or ſhew your Reader how it can be inferred from your pretended Proof; and therefore, I am ſorry that the World have ſtill Reaſon to reckon the Aſſociate Presbytery Slanderers, and you further, upon a new Charge, ſeeing you have neither made their Charge good, nor your own againſt me.

What is ſaid, expoſeth ſufficiently your Sting at the Atteſters of the extraordinary Work at *Cambuſlang*.---Your Reflection upon the Character, one of the Atteſtors giveth of the People of *Cambuſlang* is both ſtupid and profane;—'Tis ſtupid inſinuating the Meaning to be, that they would part with their Life, to obtain an Intereſt in Chriſt after Death, and that

that this is a Part of the purgatorial and Middle-State Scheme, which is falſe; for both Schemes ſuppoſe, that they who go on perfecting in Goodneſs in the other Life, have attained to a State of real Goodneſs, the ſame with an Intereſt in Chriſt in this Life.—Your Reflection is profane; for it is as much againſt *Phil.* iii. 7, 8. *Luke* xiv. 26. and many other Scriptures, as againſt what you quarrel.—I can aſſure you, dear Sir, I am heartily weary of expoſing the Falſhood and Ignorance of your Performance,—and inſtead of going through the remaining Pages, I ſhall conclude this *Letter*, with a Part of a judicious and compaſſionate *Letter* I received ſome Months ago from a Foreigner.

" And grieved I am, that in the Face of ſo much " Evidence, our dear Brethren of the Seceſſion ſhould " continue to make Oppoſition. Oh what Blind- " neſs is this which hath happened to them! The " Lord redeem their Soul from Deceit and Violence! " and may their Lives be precious in his Sight! Let " us not ceaſe to pray for them, and to wonder at " the Grace that makes us to differ! I ſympathize " with you, my dear Brother, in the Conteſts you " have been obliged to have with theſe Oppoſers. " The Wounds of Friends are deep. *It was not* " *an enemy*, (ſays the Pſalmiſt) *then I could have* " *born it, but it was thou, a man mine equal, my* " *guide and my acquaintance!* But, Sir, tho' it is " very hard and trying, that the Servants of Chriſt " and his Work, ſhould labour under Reproaches " and Miſrepreſentations from thoſe who profeſs the " ſame MASTER, and a Concern for his Cauſe in " the World; yet will our great Lord bring Glory " to his Name, and Advantage to his People here- " by; *out of this eater ſhall come forth meat*, and " out of this ſtrong Trial Sweetneſs in the Lord's " Time. He would not have ſuffered it, had he " not deſigned to bring Good out of it; and let us " wait to ſee the Might of his Power, the Greatneſs

" of

" of his Grace, and the Infinity of his Wiſdom here-
" in. Hereby, dear Sir, the Lord has given you
" and others an Opportunity of bearing Witneſs for
" Chriſt, and his Work againſt the moſt fierce Op-
" poſers, and in the Face of the keeneſt Oppoſition,
" which is and ſhall be to the Glory of our Lord,
" and to your Honour, both in this World and that
" to come. Hence there has been an Opportunity
" given of a more diligent Search into this bleſſed
" Work, and ſo for the Glories of it to be the more
" diſplayed. By your Brethrens Fall into this Op-
" poſition againſt the Lord's Work, you have had
" an Opportunity to compaſſionate them in the
" Bowels of Jeſus Chriſt, and to ſeek their Reſto-
" ration; and right glad I am, that you have been
" enabled to do it in the Spirit of Jeſus: And here-
" by, both you and we, even all that ſtand, are cal-
" led to take Heed leſt we fall; to ſee the Power,
" Malice and Subtilty of Satan, in his Prevalency
" over them, and the Malignity of Sin, and the
" Wickedneſs of our own Hearts, in the Out-break-
" ings of their Corruptions; and ſo to be humbled
" before the Lord, and the more earneſtly to ſeek
" his Grace, both for ourſelves and them, that they
" may be recovered, and we preſerved. And what
" if I ſhould ſay, however awful it is, That this
" our Brethrens Oppoſition may have been ſuffered,
" for the hardning of the Wicked? That ſo thoſe
" who liked not the Knowledge of God in this
" Work, but hated the Appearance thereof, might
" be judicially blinded. If while the God of all
" Grace, is preparing the Veſſels of Mercy for fu-
" ture Glory, he permits ſuch Things to fall out, by
" which the Veſſels of Wrath, under the Influence
" of Sin and Satan, are filled with everlaſting De-
" ſtruction; *Who may ſay unto him, what doſt thou?*
" It becomes ſinful Men to be ſilent before the Lord
" of all, and to give him the Glory of his Righte-
" ouſneſs in the moſt tremenduous Diſpenſation.

" And

"And to add no more, what if the Lord's Deſign, "in ſuffering our Brethren to fall ſo low, to make "ſo near an Approach to the unpardonable Blaſphe-"my, ſhould be to humble them the more deeply; "and to ſhew the exceeding Riches of his Grace, "in forgiving the Iniquity of their great Sin, to the "endleſs Wonder of Men and Angels, and to the "eternal Praiſe of his own Glory. And if theſe "Things, Sir, have been, and may be effected by "Means of what has happened; Shall we not have "Reaſon to admire, and adore our Almighty, All-"wiſe, and All-gracious God herein! And to ſay "with the Apoſtle, *O the depth of the wiſdom and "knowledge of God! how unſearchable are his judg-"ments, and his ways paſt finding out!* And if the "Lord ſhould further call you to ſhew forth all "Long-ſuffering towards theſe our oppoſing Bre-"thren, and to bear your Teſtimony for him in "the Face of, and againſt their Oppoſition; his "Grace is ſufficient for you, and his Power ſhall "reſt upon you, unto the Performance of your "Work; and *your labour ſhall not be in vain in "the Lord.* May the Lord grant you Wiſdom and "Grace to know and do his Will! I humbly think, "Sir, that whenever you think it may be of Ser-"vice to the Cauſe of Chriſt, it is your Duty to "make Head againſt their Oppoſition; and that "when you have done what is ſufficient to anſwer "their Objections, if they ſtill oppoſe, it is beſt to "leave them to the Lord, and humbly wait till he "ariſe to plead his own Cauſe, and make all Op-"poſition to fall before him,"

Whatever you judge of this, the unprejudiced will much approve the ſolid Thoughts of the Writer.—With this I finiſh this long Letter to you. I aſſure you that you have my moſt hearty Prayers for you, and that I am,

Dr. Br.

Yours, &c.

Kilſyth, April 1743.

JA. ROBE.

P. S. This Letter extending to an undeſigned Length, obligeth me to drop the Deſign mentioned above, to make ſome Obſerves upon ſome other Sallies of Mr. *Ralph Erſkine*, againſt this bleſſed Work and me, which I perſuade my ſelf, both you and he will excuſe.--I rather chooſe to give you a Summary of what we now certainly know concerning the State of Religion in *New England*.

Firſt, There are a great many Atteſtations to the Reality and Greatneſs of a glorious Work of God, in convincing and converting great Numbers; as alſo reviving former good Chriſtians. I have before me the Atteſtation of Seventeen Churches met in Council at *Northampton*, *May* 11th 1742. Alſo the Declaration of Fourteen Miniſters, dated at *Boſton*, *July* 1ſt, 1742. wherein they give expreſs Teſtimony to the Revival mentioned. ——I have likewiſe ſeen the Reverend Mr. *Muirhead*, a Presbyterian Miniſter in *Boſton*, his *Hiſtorical Account of the Progreſs and Continuance of this bleſſed Work in* New England, *to* June *laſt*.

2*dly*, We have good Proof, that the Promoters of this bleſſed Work, and the Promoters of the Diſorders, are different and contending Parties: And that as to the latter, they not only ſeem to be declining, but the Eyes of ſome of them, at leaſt, to be opening; and that the Extremes they have been permitted to run into, appear to be over-ruled to that End.

3*dly*, That the Oppoſition in Print is chiefly, almoſt only, by anonimous Authors; and that many of the known Oppoſers are either *Arminians*, Abettors of them, of ſuſpected, or proven bad Character as to Morals, and ſome of them diſmiſſed by their own Congregations upon foreſaid Accounts; particularly one *Caldwell*, whoſe Sermon you and your Aſſociates, in the Oppoſition made much of, is now proven to have born the Name of *Thornton* in *Ireland*, and to have fled from thence for attrocious Theſts,

Theſts, by five Affidavits ſent from *Ireland* to *New England*.——Such are now known to be the Gentlemen of fine Character, who were our laſt Year's Letter-writers from *New England*.

4*thly*, That whereas the Way of the Promoters of this Work in *New England*, is to teſtify at the ſame Time for the Work, and againſt the Diſorders which attended it; the chief Art of the other Side hath been to confine Peoples Attention to the Diſorders, by crying out againſt theſe, without taking Notice of the Goodneſs of the Work theſe Diſorders have attended.----A Maſter-piece of this laſt Kind appeared in a Paper againſt the Diſorders, without any direct explicite Teſtimony to the bleſſed Work, by a Number of Miniſters met at *Boſton* in *May* laſt; it is reckoned to have been intended by them to give unfavourable Impreſſions of this Work, to People at a Diſtance, eſpecially in *Scotland*. How little it is to be regarded, is plain from its paſſing only by a Majority of Three, that their Moderator refuſed to ſign it as approving it; that it was a ſtollen Meeting by ſome in the Oppoſition, without the Knowledge of the Friends of the Work, and the Character of theſe who made the Majority in it.----This occaſioned an Adverti ſement to the Friends of this good Work to meet in *July* laſt, to give a Teſtimony for the Work, and againſt the Diſorder. —And by the laſt Letters from *New England*, we learn that there was then an Atteſtation to the Goodneſs of the Work, by 40 or 50 Miniſters, but it was not printed at the Ship's coming off.

Laſtly, Whereas there was a great Complaint, that the *Preface* to your *Review* could not be got in this Country, the Bulk of them being ſhipped off to *New England*; this is now to acquaint the Reader, that vaſt Numbers of them are returned unſold; ſo that the Curious may now be ſupplied with them at a reaſonable Price.

F I N I S.

BRITISH
9 MY 72
MUSEUM